different viewpoints will satisfy advocates of neither.

To the extent, however, that this is an attempt to take farm policy out of partisan politics, it will be welcomed by farmers. We only hope that the members will not mount their ideological horses and ride off in all directions.

Congress Should Pass New Tidelands Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1953

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct attention to an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Daily News, of which the very able Robert L. Smith is publisher. The Daily News is a Democratic paper:

CONGRESS SHOULD PASS NEW TIDELANDS LAW

One event may be scheduled as probable for 1953 under the new Congress, and that is the recision to the States of tidelands-oil control.

This is not, never was, and never should be a partisan issue. We have never argued with the United States Supreme Court's decision that the Federal Government has a paramount interest in the tidelands. What we have contended is that the Supreme Court had to go on what the law has been and is, and until that law is changed by Congress there isn't much more that the highest tribunal can do.

What we believe will happen and should happen is that the Congress will, with a considerable majority and with both Democratic and Republican votes, amend or repeal the present law and enact a new one that will give the States full control over and title to the tidelands which lawyers and courts alike agree they had or should have had before combining to form a Union and even afterward.

It is implicit in the Constitution that in the event of war or any other crisis affecting the safety of the Union that the Federal Government shall have first and immediate access to any natural resources within our national boundaries.

ALL WANT COUNTRY TO BE SECURE

If the lawmakers conclude, after their deliberations, that the right of the Government to such access must be made explicit within the law, they should act at once to give that assurance for no good American wants his country to be anything less than completely secure.

It is absurd, and seems so even to laymen, to think that any natural resource within any State boundary not actually owned by the Federal Government should not belong either to private citizens or to the State. Otherwise no State would be in a position to develop its resources properly and titles long held and enjoyed would be, at the least, clouded and at the worst a source of possible bankruptcy for many municipalities, firms, and individuals. With a State in doubt as to its title to its own lands it would destroy the right of eminent domain.

At the moment there is grave uncertainty about who owns what in the way of tidelands oil and it is threatening a chaotic situation. There is, for one thing, a fund of $40,000,000 impounded and useless which, if the States were certain of their tidelands ownership, would go to parks and beaches for development. These funds have accrued from oil royalties. If Congress elects to give the States control with a proviso that such funds are to be used for education, as some urge, it is relatively immaterial. What is material is that the States should have the title and be allowed to use royalties as they see fit.

OILMEN DON'T CARE WHO OWNS IT

Quite a legend has sprung up to the effect that the big oil companies want the States to have title to the tidelands because these companies can better control State governments. That is poppycock. Actually the big oil companies do not care who owns the title so long as they can get a fair and reasonable break from whatever level of government that holds the title. Individual oilmen, like individual citizens of whatever occupation, differ in their personal attitudes. They would be strange if they didn't.

It seems a little illogical to assume that an oil company or anyone else concerned with oil could or would seek to corrupt the State government of California any more than they would seek to corrupt the Government of the United States. We are certain that such a notion would not be regarded by Republicans as a grade A thesis in view of the fact that a good Republican heads the California government and a good Democrat has headed the Federal Government for some time.

It is not, as we said at the start, a partisan matter. It is simply a question of right and justice—a question of whether a sovereign State has the same right to control its resources that it has to administer justice and the economic life of its people and its territory.

Import Duty on Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1953

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, as my first legislative act in the Eighty-third Congress, I am pleased to sponsor a measure, introduced today, which will continue the suspension of the import duty on copper to June 30, 1954.

In my first term, I recognized the need for encouragement of copper imports to supplement the domestic supply. It was evident that unemployment in the brass industry would pose a serious economic threat to the well-being of my constituents if insufficient copper were available for fabrication. The maintenance of a defense program also necessitated governmental cooperation in the procurement of copper from foreign sources. The Patterson Act of 1947, and subsequent enactments has been responsible for the boost in supplies from that period, and has additionally strengthened our ties with our fine neighbor to the south, Chile. The Chilean economy is mainly dependent upon copper exports, and we have gained a mutual advantage through the suspension of the tax.

No harm has come to our domestic producers from this legislation, and I can foresee none from its continuance through the first half of 1954. The supply of copper from all sources does not yet meet the demand, and there will be no appreciable shift in that situation for some time to come.

I am impressed with the personal assurance given me by the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means that this bill will be the first order of business on the committee's agenda. I trust that the Congress will complete action before the February 15 expiration of the present suspension.

Why Is Mr. Churchill Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1953

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the great and distinguished Prime Minister of Great Britain has hurried here for an unprecedented conference with General Eisenhower before the general has even taken over the reigns of government. Anyone who has studied Mr. Churchill's conduct of diplomacy know that only matters deemed by him to be of great urgency could cause him to personally visit General Eisenhower at this particular time. Other less dramatic means of communication are readily available and their use would entail no questions of protocol and propriety. Of course, no one will be expected to take seriously the Prime Minister's explanation that his visit with the President-elect is incidental to a vacation trip.

Just what are the problems which are agitating the Prime Minister? What course of action contemplated by the general does he wish to influence or change? We should bear in mind that Mr. Churchill had much to do with General Eisenhower's rise to fame. It was Mr. Churchill who approved of General Eisenhower as Commander in Chief of operations in Africa at a time when a very large percentage of the forces in his command were British. Mr. Churchill, in his history of the second war explains his part in the selection of General Eisenhower for his several wartime assignments. The Prime Minister, in his books, is glowing in his praise of his friend Ike. Naturally, Mr. Churchill feels, and no doubt rightly so, that he can be more persuasive with the general than any other representative of a foreign nation.

Certainly I have no objection to Mr. Churchill's visit. In fact, I welcome it. He is a great and distinguished world figure. My esteem for him is such that I have read every word of the some 4,000 pages in five volumes of his history of the Second World War, but I still would like to know just what brings him here at this time.

Critics of the incumbent administration have constantly demanded that President Wilson's "open covenants openly arrived at" be adhered to. Well, now they have a chance to prove their sincerity. Without subterfuge or diplomatic double talk let them explain the purpose of the Prime Minister's unprecedented mission.

South Koreans and Chinese Nationalist troops, we will not only ease the pressure on our own men but will make the opposition to aggression in that part of the world, Asiatic in character. This will deal a second blow—this time at Russian propaganda—which tries to becloud the issue by saying that western nations are invading Asia.

This fiction will be exposed as more and more Asiatics join in driving Russian mercenaries out of Korea, which is part of Asia.

When the President-elect of the United States said during the political campaign that he would go in person to Korea to size up the situation and see what could be done to break the stalemate, he struck a responsive chord in the hearts of the American people.

This has ceased to be a partisan issue. It concerns the Nation and the cause of world peace. We do not separate our soldiers into Republican or Democratic divisions.

There is not much time left for sidestepping the main concern of most Americans.

It is: "What next in Korea?"

When Vishinsky gets up to speak in the U. N. there is a curl of contempt on his lips, for he knows that he is playing to confusion and weakness. When allied armies batter his second-hand forces in Korea, his gang calls for a truce to ward off disaster.

That worked once.

It won't again.

The United States cannot abandon Korea, for no nation can ever respect a coward. And it cannot appease. For no matter how slick an arrangement could be contrived, appeasement would be detected for what it is—which is delayed surrender.

And yet we cannot bog down in wordy deadlock.

Korea is the battlefield. Localized there, decided there, it could convince Russia that further aggression anywhere else would not be profitable, and Russia would have learned the great lesson without directly losing face.

The issue cannot be frozen, it cannot be abandoned, it cannot be put off to another day. There are no rain checks in Korea.

The time has come to call Russia's bluff. I believe that the Kremlin will back down, passing the buck to the Chinese Reds as she has planned all along in case things went wrong.

The contention that this might extend the war is not valid now. The free world is becoming stronger with each passing day. Russia had a frightening opportunity several years ago when Europe was so weak and our own defenses had been cut to the bone. Whatever else may be said about the Communists, they do not ignore clear evidence of growing military might in the opposite camp.

We have gained time in which to become strong.

Russia did not attack when all the odds favored its military machine. It won't gamble now, for its advantage has passed. And the recent reliable reports that the United States has exploded the first hydrogen bomb is a further deterrent.

I believe that we should fix a time limit for the acceptance of truce terms. If that deadline should pass without a real armistice, then we should employ every weapon and all the outside manpower that has been offered to us, plus additional reinforcements from reluctant allies, to force a military decision in Korea.

I am confident that a strong declaration of purpose, backed by clear evidence that we mean to go through with it, will swiftly bring the Communists to terms and end the war.

If we could check with our men in Korea, I believe that they would prefer a showdown to force the peace or a massive military break-through to victory. They who have most at stake do not want to suffer on and on without end and without reason.

Decision day is near in Korea.

President Should Not Block Tidelands Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1953

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from Utah has brought into the open a heretofore "back stage" fight over the tidelands which has been going on within inner circles of the administration for several days. Urged on by diehards and poor losers with support from get-rich-quick claim jumpers the President has been put under pressure to take last-minute action calculated to hamper and complicate imminent solution of the tidelands controversy. Such ill-considered vindictive action would amount to an admission that the administration is capable of the kind of attitude of which it has been accused by its most extreme critics.

Several days ago I advised the President by telegram that I had heard rumors about his contemplated order and asked him to see me before making an irrevocable decision to issue it. I have had no reply to my wire.

The proposed order establishing a naval petroleum reserve was drafted several years ago. Its purpose was to try to force Congress to set up legal machinery for administration of the tidelands. The scheme was abandoned as inadvisable and illegal. In addition to this it was found that the Navy opposed being in the oil business and had found the handling of existing naval petroleum reserves overly difficult and unsatisfactory. Obviously the dusting off of this discarded scheme is for political effect and not for reasons of conservation or national defense.

The tidelands claimants who have filed on valuable producing off-shore oil lands and who assert a right to take them over as political war booty are most anxious, for technical legal reasons, to see the proposed order issued. Their filings are based on the theory that the off-shore fields are public lands within the meaning of the Federal leasing law under which they are trying to assert their fantastic claims. The Interior Department has ruled that the off-shore areas are not such public lands. But naval petroleum reserves are cut out of public lands.

This is the real reason for the avid interest of the claim jumpers who stand to make millions overnight if they can use the administration to crown their machinations with success. Of course, they know time is short and they are desperate. The incoming administration is pledged to a tidelands solution favorable to the States and in line with the expressed will of Congress. Unable to talk the necessary administration officials into recognizing their filings, they are trying to help their pending legal cases by innocent-looking action setting up a naval reserve. This is what is back of the last-minute efforts to induce the President to take action which may damage the Nation by delaying needed offshore oil development, and a speedy solution of the tidelands controversy. I hope the President will not stoop to the kind of political action being urged on him by the treasure hunters, who appear to have no sincere regard for the President's place in history, the Democratic Party, or even the best interests of the United States. Until shown to the contrary, I will not believe the President can be pressured into such unwise action. The order has not yet been issued. I hope it never will be.

America—The Beacon Light to a Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY A. FINE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1953

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, with the convening of the Eighty-third Congress, the New Yorker magazine of January 3, 1953, provides a splendidly appropriate editorial blueprinting the program for freedom, peace, and justice for all peoples everywhere.

I submit this editorial to the new Congress under extension of my remarks.

The editorial follows:

The periods when the world has relaxed and bloomed and prospered have been few and far between. To date the human race has not distinguished itself in the field of universal accomplishment—only in the narrower fields of colonial and national enterprise. The beginning of 1953 may simply be the slight bump in time that leads to more of the same, or it may be the start of the threshold era, with the atom emerging as the key to the peaceable kingdom.

The chances for a happy ending to the miserable story of these grim and bloody years will be improved, we think, if the new government in Washington can manage a shift in emphasis in the national planning and working. As America goes into 1953, its old shell is almost shed; the new America is bigger and more widely distributed, and has far greater responsibilities. Since the start of the cold war, we've had to use much of our time and money building a military machine capable of meeting what everyone knows may come. The reason for it is good, but the immediate effect of it is extremely bad in many respects. To create a tremendous war machine strengthens our castle, but it also blows the fire. The higher one goes in power, the hotter grows the air around him. Where, then, is any end to a cycle like this, where is the rift in the clouds through which shows the blue sky that people everywhere long to see? It is, we believe, in performing constructive deeds in addition to forging destructive weapons, and in breaking the sound barrier that now prevents us from communicating with other people—people who do not necessarily hate us, even though they are being schooled to hate us.

Such a shift in emphasis could create a change in weather. We can't afford the shift if it means weakening our fighting strength or failing our military allies, but perhaps the shift can be made without such an effect, for the important thing is the emphasis, and money is not the only stuff that creates

It continues the tested policy of controlled quota and nonquota immigration as established by the overwhelming majority of the Congress in 1921.

The basic formula governing the distribution of the quotas is known as the system of national origins, worked out on a scientific basis in the early 1920's and embodied in the Immigration Act of 1924.

Within the national origins system, the new Immigration and Nationality Act has made certain important adjustments removing inequities and discriminations, to wit:

1. Racial discriminations inaugurated first in the nineteenth century (aimed then at the Chinese) and later extended to the entire so-called Asiatic barred zone, have been completely removed by the new law. All independent countries of the world and self-governing territories, regardless of the racial composition of their population, have been assigned immigration quotas. That includes, among others, Japan, Korea, Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon, India, etc. While placing all races and all nations on an equal footing, the new law embodies a formula, devised by the Department of State, and designed to forestall the possibility of a disproportionate influx of orientals.

2. All discriminations based on sex as they existed in the immigration and nationality laws were repealed, the net effect of this repeal being that whatever rights and privileges were granted under the law to the male apply now to both sexes.

3. Within the national-origins system, the new act established a new method of selecting immigrants based on the needs of the United States. The top preference (50 percent of each quota) has been granted to persons whose services are urgently needed in the United States because of their education, skills, or special knowledge.

The total quota as established under the new act differs very little from that proclaimed under the 1924 act. The total annual quota beginning on January 1, 1953, is 154,657 as against 154,277 in effect until December 31, 1952.

However, it is safe to assume that the volume of immigration into the United States will considerably increase under the new act since spouses of American citizens and alien children of such citizens have been uniformly granted the status of nonquota immigrants. Under the now repealed laws, such nonquota status was not available to all husbands of American citizens and not to all children, the differences in their status being predicated on their race, date of marriage, etc.

The most debated of the many features of the new act seems to be one that has not originated with the authors of this legislation, namely, the national-origins system. As already stated, this system was first embodied in the statute books in 1921 when the decision was made by the Congress to keep the ethnic composition of the American Nation as it was found to be when the census was taken in 1920. It was then decided that each country of the world should continue to send immigrants to the United States in proportion to the extent of its contribution to the total population of the United States.

It is submitted that this policy could not be described, with fairness, as discriminatory. It does not contemplate to say that one national group is inferior, or that another group is superior. It simply means that they are different. To be discriminating in the sense that one is discerning is one thing, but to be accused of practicing discrimination against certain nationals and races was certainly abhorrent to the sponsors of the new law and they have proved it by removing the true, antiquated racial discriminations directed against the orientals.

It is not believed that every child born in every country of the globe brings with it to the world the inherent right to migrate to the United States at some time or another. It is therefore a fallacy to assume that the United States Congress deprives anyone of this nonexistent birthright when it exercises control over immigration, such control being the function of a sovereign and, in the case of the United States, the function of the Congress under article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution. There is a multitude of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States defining and sustaining that power of the Congress. To quote just a few of them—in *Chae Chan Ping* v. *United States* (130 U. S. 581 (1889)); *Edy* v. *Robertson, Collector* (112 U. S. 580 (1884)), the Court said:

"The power of Congress to control immigration stems from the sovereign authority of the United States as a Nation and from the constitutional power of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

In *Nishimura Ekiu* v. *United States* (142 U. S. 651, 659 (1892)), the Court stated:

"Every sovereign nation has power, inherent in sovereignty and essential to self-preservation, to forbid entrance of foreigners within its dominions, or to admit them only in such cases and upon such conditions as it may see fit to prescribe."

In *Fok Young Yo* v. *United States* (185 U. S. 296 (1902)), the Court said:

"Congress may exclude aliens altogether or prescribe terms and conditions upon which they may come into or remain in this country."

Bearing in mind the present conditions of the world and the existence of a world-wide conspiracy determined to achieve world domination through the overthrow of the United States Government, and the constitutional system of the United States, the new law has revised and tightened up all procedures governing the screening of aliens who might endanger internal security of the United States or by their conduct cause otherwise detriment to the American people (subversives and criminals).

However, the constitutional clause of due process and the safeguards of fair administrative procedures, with decisions reviewable in the course of administrative or judicial appeals, have been scrupulously maintained. The sole exception from that rule is the Attorney General's authority to exclude a dangerous subversive alien without disclosing the information upon which such exclusion is based, if he deems such disclosure to endanger United States security. But, even in this instance, the excluded alien is permitted to submit to the Attorney General his own version of the story.

For the first time in the history of the American immigration laws, a redemption clause has been included in the new law. Under this clause, a former member of any totalitarian conspiracy, including the Communist Party, is no more forever barred from the United States. He could be admitted if he shows that he has discontinued his membership in the proscribed organization and that he had actively opposed its ideology for at least 5 years.

Similarly, a new humanitarian feature appears in those sections of the new law which deal with deportation. Of course, criminals, subversives, and aliens who entered the United States illegally are deportable, but ample discretionary authority is vested in the Attorney General permitting him to cancel deportation orders on humanitarian grounds, even in the case of criminals, former subversives, narcotic peddlers, etc., if their deportation would cause disruption of their American families and if they can show 10 years of perfect conduct since the commission of the crime.

Cognizant of the new situation of leadership the United States has acquired among the community of the world's free nations, the new law facilitates the exchange of information, scientific knowledge, special experience in international trading, etc., through the creation of several new classes of nonimmigrants, coming to this country temporarily. There is a special new type of visa created for foreign newspapermen, radio commentators, and film or television operators working for foreign information media. There is a new class of temporary nonimmigrants embracing industrial trainees, people who want to acquire the American know-how. There is a new type of temporary visa for foreign scholars, technicians, lecturers, etc., in addition to the first-preference permanent visa for professors. Of course, a visa for foreign students is available as it has been under the old law, except that the foreign students are now not limited to attending schools of academic nature. Liberalizing that provision, the new law permits young people from foreign countries to attend American business and commercial schools, art schools, nurses training schools, schools of theater and voice training, etc.

NATURALIZATION

In the field of naturalization, the new law essentially continues the provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940 with one very important change, namely, the complete elimination of the bar to naturalization because of race. People of all races eligible to remain in the United States permanently are now eligible to become United States citizens and that includes the over 85,000 long-time Japanese residents, most of them on the west coast and in Hawaii.

Further liberalization of the provisions related to naturalization has been obtained through the enactment of the following features of the new law: (1) The minimum age for filing a petition for naturalization has been lowered from 20 years to 18 years; (2) declaration of intention (the so-called first papers), which has caused many complications in the past, has been made permissive (optional) and not a mandatory prerequisite to naturalization; and (3) protection against loss of citizenship in the case of naturalized citizens who live abroad for extended periods of time has been considerably extended by giving its benefit to veterans of World War II and their families, to persons residing abroad for a variety of reasons connected with their business or profession and for all naturalized citizens who had been naturalized over 25 years prior to the time they take up residence abroad.

Reflecting the concern of Congress with the high percentage of foreign-born among subversives, racketeers, gamblers, etc., the new law permits the institution of judicial proceedings aimed at cancellation of citizenship in cases of aliens who within 5 years after naturalization have joined a subversive organization, or who within 10 years after naturalization have been convicted of contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions propounded to them by a congressional committee. It seems worth stressing that contrary to widespread propaganda the denaturalization in the above described two instances is not automatic, but subject to full and complete judicial procedure with all avenues of appeal to higher Federal courts fully open.

The Offshore Oil Issue Will Rise Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 1953

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Louisville Courier-Journal of November 10, 1952:

THE OFFSHORE OIL ISSUE WILL RISE AGAIN

Republican control of Congress makes it practically certain that another tidelands oil bill will be passed by the next session, similar to the bill passed by the recent Congress, and vetoed by President Truman. It is unlikely that President-elect Eisenhower will veto any measure relinquishing the Government's claim to offshore oil lands, for both he and the Republican Party advocated State control of the so-called tidelands oil during the campaign. And, partly because of the misnomer, "tidelands," the whole matter of offshore oil has become so emotional and so involved in the argument over States' rights versus Federal control that a logical defense of the Government's claim to the submerged lands has become almost impossible.

Actually, the Government has never made any claim to oil under the tidelands (that is, the land covered and uncovered by ebb and flow of tides) of either Texas, Louisiana, or California. It has claimed that the oil taken from the Continental Shelf, the vast reach of land lying under shallow oceans off the American coast, belongs to the Federal Government. The Supreme Court held, on June 17, 1947, that the submerged lands off the coast of California did not belong to the State, but that the United States had a paramount right in them. On June 5, 1950, the Supreme Court made a similar ruling on the submerged lands off the coasts of Texas and Louisiana.

Neither California nor Louisiana has ever been able to muster a convincing argument in favor of their control of offshore oil. The case of Texas is somewhat different. California and Louisiana were created out of territory purchased by the United States from foreign governments. Texas was an independent republic when she was admitted to the Union in 1846. And under the joint congressional resolution admitting Texas as a State, Texas was permitted to retain all of its vacant and unappropriated lands. Texans claim that this gives them control of offshore lands, though they admit that when the republic was dissolved, upon admission to the Union, Texas ceded to the United States all ports, harbors, and navy properties.

There is another factor that further confuses the Texas tidelands claims. In 1836 the legislature of the Republic of Texas passed a law extending Texas' legal boundaries three marine leagues (about 10½ miles) into the sea. In the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, signed by Mexico and the United States in 1848, the boundary between the United States and what had been the Republic of Texas was to begin three leagues in the sea from the mouth of the Rio Grande River. Thus, when the tidelands oil bill was passed last May, in an effort to override the Supreme Court, Texas was given control of lands three marine leagues into the sea, whereas California and Louisiana were given control only to the 3-mile limit. And many foes of the tidelands oil bill admitted that a bill relating only to the rights of Texas to submerged oil lands would have more support than one giving all submerged lands back to the States.

To give the States control of all submerged lands off their coasts would be a precedent of gravest importance, especially since these lands contain oil reserves (some as far out as 40 miles from the coast) that are vital to national defense, and should be kept in reserve by the Federal Government. The Supreme Court has noted that none of the States concerned has any inherent right in submerged land, either in the Constitution or in any interpretation of our laws. The lands have always been treated as Federal territory. Our Navy and Coast Guard patrol, dredge, improve, and protect the waters that cover these lands, and have always exercised jurisdiction over offshore areas. The Republicans will be setting a dangerous precedent if they ignore these facts.

International Crimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1953

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a resolution adopted at the Pulaski Day dinner in Gary, Ind., on October 12, 1952.

The dinner at which this resolution was passed was under the auspices of the Indiana Department of the Polish American Congress, Inc.

RESOLUTION 7

Assembled at the Pulaski Day dinner in Gary, Ind., on this 12th day of October 1952, as a group representing all walks of life—the clergy, public officials, professional men, industry, banking, and labor organizations—we resolve:

1. To request the Government of the United States to declare null and void all secret agreements made in Teheran and Yalta, without the consent of the American and Polish peoples and other nations directly subjugated to communistic imperialism by said agreements;

2. To demand that diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and the puppet government of Poland be severed immediately in view of the fact that Soviet agents and terrorists are unceasingly perpetrating acts of genocide on the Polish Nation; and that the Warsaw regime Embassy in Washington be closed immediately due to the well-known fact that said Embassy, while acting under the immunity of diplomatic laws, in reality is a nest of Soviet spies and saboteurs constituting a nucleus of a fifth column in America;

3. To demand that the only legal government of the Republic of Poland, namely the Polish government-in-exile, now in existence in London, be rendered immediate diplomatic recognition by the United States Government;

4. To ask that the United States Congress create a special committee to investigate all acts of genocide perpetrated on our sons taken prisoners of war in Korea, and to ascertain why official silence in Washington blankets all these savage murders;

5. To request that the United States Congress, at its next session in January of 1953, refer the report of the Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre to the proper authorities in the United Nations with a request that an international tribunal be formed to pass judgment on the criminals.

We extend our thanks to Prof. Sir Douglas Savory, to Maj. Tuffton Beamish, and to the other members of the British Parliament for their insistence that Her Majesty's Government of Great Britain take active part in the Katyn Forest Massacre investigations and support the planned resolution of the United States to the United Nations Assembly to the effect that an international tribunal be empowered to weigh the evidence and to pass judgment in this act of genocide.

And we appeal to the United States Senate to ratify at its earliest session the treaty on genocide as prepared and presented by the United Nations' Commission on Human Rights.

We thank His Excellency Henry F. Schricker, Governor of Indiana, and Hon. Peter Mandich, mayor of Gary, for proclamations designating October 11 as Pulaski Day in Indiana and in Gary, respectively.

We extend sincere words of appreciation to the press and the radio for their active support in organizing and planning this Pulaski Day dinner.

And we pledge ourselves to vigilantly guard and defend the freedoms and the American way of life.

REV. LOUIS MICHALSKI,
Chairman,
VALERIE MACKOWIAK,
JOHN F. ROSZKOWSKI,
JOHN WALEROWICZ,
MICHAEL BITTNER,
JOSEPH J. WIEWIORA,
STANLEY PAUSZEK,
STELLA SZYMKOWSKI,
VINCENT A. BASINSKI,
Secretary, Committee of Resolution.

Passed and unanimously approved by all participants.

For the Pulaski Day dinner committee:
FELIX A. KAUL,
Chairman.
TED. PUCHOWSKI,
Secretary.

For the Department of Indiana of the Polish American Congress, Inc.:
BENJAMIN J. LESNIAK,
President.

For the committee of commemorations and special activities of the Indiana Department of the Polish American Congress, Inc.:
VINCENT A. BASINSKI,
Chairman.

GARY, IND. *October 12, 1952.*

Truman's Atom Bomb Action Won Respect of Joe Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERA BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1953

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 5, 1953, entitled "Truman's Atom Bomb Action Won Respect of Joe Stalin," by John E. Jones, political editor of the Post-Gazette.

It seems to me that this article is particularly significant in the light of the great message of President Truman on the state of the Union.

TRUMAN'S ATOM BOMB ACTION WON RESPECT OF JOE STALIN
(By John E. Jones)

The little guy is retiring from office, and a lot of people, especially Republicans, will be glad. A lot more, especially Democrats, will be sorry because he has extended them favors over the years. A few, including myself, will continue to treat him with respect. For Harry S. Truman is the man of the month in politics so far as this department is concerned. The distinction, I know, will not bring him any laurels in addition to what he has earned or received during almost 8 years in the White House. It won't even buy him a cup of coffee.

But when Mr. Truman told a reporter the other day that the most noteworthy achievement of his administrations, in his opinion, was keeping the United States out of, or from having a hand in starting, World War III, I'll go along.

I'll go along because I heard a story 6 years ago that should have been told the

National Foreign Trade Convention meeting in November 1952 resolved in strongest terms against the creation of the proposed corporation. * * * Thus the business community * * * indicates * * * that it thinks the idea is bad and should be abandoned. It would be difficult or impossible under these circumstances to push the project forward and to secure the support of the new administration and the necessary enabling legislation from the new Congress. * * *

"It is suggested therefore that the same purposes be accomplished in other and easier ways, the most important of which would be, as recommended above, an extension of the activities of the Export-Import Bank in the field of unguaranteed development loans."

Tideland Transfer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1953

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of January 13, 1953:

TIDELAND TRANSFER

An Executive order transferring the so-called tideland oil area from the Interior Department to the Navy Department would have only a single, simple effect: it would dramatize for the American people the significance of this area for the national defense. It would place no new obstacle whatever in the way of legislation giving the area away to the coastal States. It would not in any way impede President-elect Eisenhower's approval of such legislation. It would merely make the meaning of the act more plain. And this, no doubt, is why President Truman is contemplating it. It is also, no doubt, why proponents of the give-away are so enraged about the proposed gesture.

The proposed excutive order would convert the tideland area into a naval petroleum reserve, giving it exactly the same status as, say, Elk Hills or Teapot Dome. If Congress chose to do so, it could, presumably, enact legislation giving Elk Hills or Teapot Dome away to California or to Wyoming, the States in which these reserves are located, respectively. But it would be clear then that Congress was giving away to a single State an asset belonging to all the people of the United States—and an asset specifically dedicated to the security of the United States.

It was the Navy that initiated and sponsored the movement to determine ownership of offshore oil, because the Navy considered this oil vital to security. The Supreme Court said, when at last the question reached it in 1947, that the United States has full dominion over the marginal sea; the proposed Executive order would do no more than dedicate what belongs to the country to its defense. Teapot Dome, it will be recalled, was created as a naval reserve by President Wilson in 1915.

Agitation to remove it from Federal control led to its transfer in 1921 from the Navy to the Interior Department and then to the leasing of it by Secretary Fall to private interests. If it is embarrassing to a Republican Congress to be reminded of the Teapot Dome scandal—or to have the defense implications of tideland oil made clear—so much the better for the national welfare.

A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1953

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to note the retirement from Congress of a great Texan and a great American, the Honorable Tom Connally, a man who while serving his State and his country with great distinction for some half a century has come to represent to Capitol visitors the personification of a United States Senator. Serving in that House of Congress since 1928 he has been, as a writer aptly phrased it, one of the Senate's greatest landmarks of 24 years. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Friday, January 2, edition of the Beaumont Journal:

(By Elizabeth Carpenter)

WASHINGTON, January 2.—The United States Senate opens Saturday at noon with all of its aplomb and traditions. Even the famous snuffboxes will be freshly filled. But one of its greatest landmarks of 24 years—Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, of the white mane, the gnarled nose, the white boiled shirt with gold studs, and wide black bow tie, will be missing.

The show somehow won't be the same with one of its most delightful actors in retirement. For 11 years, across the Capitol in the House of Representatives, the tall, black-haired young Texan who stood straight as an arrow, drew the gallery applause with his rapier-like debate. In 1928 he moved to the Senate. And in these later years even as he grew more stooped and gray, he was still the No. 1 attraction for Capitol visitors. Age mellowed him.

His entrance to the Senate floor always set the gallery nudging to point out the man who, in this generation, and perhaps in future generations, looks most like a United States Senator. Always quick to giggle at the old-timed "aint's" which sprinkled his debate, the gallery will wait a long time for an orator with the homespun flow of humor, frequently sharp but never mean, the gestures from as high as he could reach down to the floor.

The 75-year-old Senator, to be replaced by 41-year-old Texas Attorney General PRICE DANIEL on Saturday, will be at his home in another part of the city as Congress opens. His plans for the future are indefinite but they call for some traveling, with Washington still as his principal address. Later, he may take an office downtown.

The shift of Senators from Texas marks the passage of an era. When Tom Connally first entered the Senate, he was one of many who dressed in the old-fashioned coats, high collars and vests bespeaking the dignity of the office. Cutaway coats and striped pants were not uncommon. But time has changed that. In recent years, Connally's manner of dress has been so unusual as to prompt requests from around the world for his famous bow ties and even scraps of his shirttail. As a farewell to the Senate barber who has trimmed his locks for many years, Connally last week presented him with one of his bow ties.

Only Senator CLYDE HOEY, of North Carolina, who wears a frocktail coat and a carnation remains in the Senate of the group, mostly southerners, whose dress has been a trade-mark of their office.

The retirement of Senator Connally is the passage of an era, too, in campaign techniques. For Connally was part of the school that just struck out across 254 counties of Texas, shaking hands in a barber shop or on a courthouse square, making the eagles scream in the shade of a mesquite. Perhaps one friend would accompany him, perhaps he would go it alone.

The new advertising agency type of campaigning with its advance guard which precedes the candidate tossing verbal confetti, its carefully timed press releases, billboards, and methodical entourage, is a technique strange to the Connally school of politics. It is, however, so much what the public has come to expect from its candidates that last spring when the Senator appeared in the Texas Panhandle with no warning, no reservations, no appointments but just, as he put it "came out to pay a visit," the local politicians were flabbergasted.

I called on the Senator this week as his office was being vacated. Files were being moved out to the Library of Congress, some 90 of them, filled with papers, manuscripts, and photographs which writers of contemporary history already are requesting.

The large gallery of pictures from the wall of the Senator's private office had been removed, shots of the Senator standing behind the white picket fence of the old Connally home in Marlin, of him with Churchill, Roosevelt, Truman, scores of leaders whose names shall forever be part of the Nation's historic rise to world leadership.

Only the dust outlined the square spaces where they had hung. The Senator pulled himself to his feet and greeted me—a courtesy not always extended to visitors by the newer Senators.

His name first appeared on Texas ballots in 1901, he recalled, and he added, with pride, "in that entire period there has never been a hint or an insinuation of any wrongdoing."

His code of morals, he said, is that any public servant "should wash his hands of everything except his duty to the people and his country under the Constitution.

That didn't mean, he added, that he thinks Washington has been more corrupt now than ever.

"I was here under Harding," he chuckled, "and good God, you couldn't get more corrupt than that."

Reflecting on his long life of public service, the Senator remarked that there was nothing in the world he would rather have done than to have served in the Senate.

"There have been lots of satisfactions in it," he said, and added with a grin, "lots of laughs."

Four times, he noted, he crossed the Atlantic to help lay the groundwork for the establishment of a United Nations, which, he believes "despite some of its shortcomings, offers us our best hope for peace."

Senator Connally still feels that the speech he made to a joint session of the Texas Legislature deploring Roosevelt's court-packing plan was his best.

He likes to recall, too, the famous remark of his father who advised him as a youngster, "Son, if I'd a-had your education, I'd a-gone to Congress," and his own advice to his son, Federal Judge Ben Connally, "Politics is a cussed trade, son, even if you're good at it."

Not long ago Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, paid tribute to the retiring Texan, recalling that he once thrilled to Connally's speeches as he read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in his country law office in Georgia.

"Tom Connally's record is embalmed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the archives of the Nation, and in the hearts of the people," declared RUSSELL in an impassioned speech. "It is more imperishable than would be any memorial constituted of metal or stone. He has served his country well with devotion and unselfish patriotism."

but the big news was the direction from which it came.

Issued by Karl L. Wagner, State commander of the American Legion, it represented the views of the Oregon Veterans Legislative Committee, an organization composed of the Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Legion, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Spanish-American War Veterans.

The committee, Wagner announced, had decided against asking the legislature for additional loyalty oaths. He said the existing affirmative loyalty oaths—similar to those taken by National and State government officials—are sufficient if enforced by school authorities.

"The committee takes the position that sincere educators and public officials are best qualified to enforce loyalty laws," Wagner's statement declared. "The committee realizes that an educator must, to be effective, be allowed academic freedom, but emphasizes that such freedom does not extend to the privilege of teaching precepts that are inimical to our system of Government."

The action was the latest in a series of expressions of confidence in the State's schools and opposition to the imposition of additional "antidisloyalty" oaths on teachers and professors. Previously, the State grange, State synod of the Presbyterian Church, League of Women Voters and others had taken similar stands.

Immediate support of the action and high praise for the veterans' groups came from the State's press and from leading educators and public figures in Oregon. Educators generally accepted it not only as an expression of support for the fundamental purposes of education, but as a challenge to "continue and to strengthen our efforts to keep our own houses in order—our schools worthy of the confidence which has been placed in us."

President H. K. Newburn, of the University of Oregon, a member of the executive committee of the American Council on Education and a former member of the President's Commission on Higher Education, termed the veterans' statement "an action of far-reaching significance to education in this country."

"I am confident," said he, "that my colleagues in higher education will agree that it is an expression of confidence and support which should win the wholehearted thanks and commendation of all thinking citizens. We here at the University of Oregon agree that it is our continuing responsibility to keep our house in order and we renew our allegiance to those concepts which are the foundation for education in a democratic society."

Thus Oregon, always proud of its record of independence, once again was demonstrating its belief in human rights and the worth of the individual. It was an example for the rest of the education world.

Value of Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1953

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting editorial entitled "Value of Railroads," published in the Oil City Derrick of January 13, 1953.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALUE OF RAILROADS

Suppose it were necessary to entirely replace, equipment and all, every one of the class I railroads of this country today. How much do you think it would cost?

Even in these days of loose talk in nine figures, the sum staggers the imagination. It would be in the neighborhood of $60,000,000,000.

That is nearly double the amount of money now in circulation in this country. It is more than the total value of all our farm property. It is equal to $380 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

That is what the railroads are worth, at present-day labor costs and material prices. And each day that value goes up a little, as new cars and locomotives are put in service, and facilities of many kinds are improved or built.

None could say that our railroads aren't worth $60,000,000,000—or any other sum that could be named. The value of their services can't be measured solely in terms of money.

The iron horse performs a tremendous job and it is one of the Nation's biggest taxpayers.

Reaction to Naval Petroleum Reserve Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1953

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Congress to two newspaper references to the former President's order declaring offshore submerged lands a naval petroleum reserve. One is an editorial from the Los Angeles Mirror and the other an article by Jay Franklin which appeared in the Inglewood Daily News:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Mirror]

A LAME DUCK ON TIDELAND WATERS

President Truman's lame-duck decision to make tidelands oil a Navy petroleum reserve is a little on the shabby side, the motive undoubtedly being to put his successor on a spot.

Truman has tried to picture return of the tidelands to the States as a "steal" from the country at large. Now, when Ike revokes the Navy reserve order, as he probably will, the man from Missouri can yell that it's a steal from the Navy.

Actually, it will be no spot for Ike. He spoke out plainly during the campaign for giving back the tidelands rights the States had owned without question for over 150 years. Some 33,000,000 voters in 39 States saw nothing wrong with that position, nor will they see anything wrong when our new President carries out his campaign promise.

The big cry from States' rights opponents has been that the oil interests are behind the return move. That's a batch of the stuff known as malarkey.

Title to the lands remains in the State and cannot be transferred to private interests. Where recovery is done by private concerns it is on a contract and royalty basis.

Royalties collected by California are double those collected by the Federal Government on oil and minerals extracted from Federal lands; Long Beach collects up to around 90 percent on some of its wells.

But even if not another drop of oil were to be taken from the tidelands, the doctrine of paramount Federal rights carries a threat to every State where there are navigable waters.

It would cloud title to port structures built beyond high-tide line and to any structure built on filled-in lands, ranging from warehouses to such things as Chicago's outer drive.

That's the reason why some 40 Senators, many from States that haven't a drop of oil in their submerged lands, have joined to introduce legislation to return tidelands to the States.

Harry's last-gasp scheme to put Ike on a tidelands spot will get nowhere.

[From the Inglewood (Calif.) Daily News]

WE, THE PEOPLE

(By Jay Franklin)

Washington reports that Mr. Truman is considering seizure of the tidelands oil for Navy reserves. This would confront General Eisenhower with what the Democrats nostalgically believe would be another Teapot Dome situation.

During the First World War, the Wilson administration set aside Teapot Dome in Wyoming for the Navy. Under Harding, after some folding money had changed hands, Teapot Dome was transferred to the Sinclair oil interests, at the same time that the Doheny oil interests got a crack at the Elk Hills reserve in southern California. When this was uncovered by Senator Walsh, of Montana, it made a legendary stink that haunted the GOP for the next 20 years.

In the case of the tidelands oil, the possibility of a stink can be discounted. The election returns decided, among other things, that a majority of the American people agreed to the Eisenhower proposition that the States involved—chiefly California, Texas, and Louisiana—should get back their title to the off-shore oil. So there is no need for folding money or hole-in-corner sneak operations. All that needs be done is for Congress to pass the same legislation that Mr. Truman twice vetoed and the States will resume title to the oil-rich lands. An Executive order by Mr. Truman would not affect this process or taint it with scandal. If there is a scandal at all, it has been discounted in advance by the votes of the majority of American citizens.

Personally, I never have had any deep convictions pro or con on the issue of the tidelands oil. Whatever the authority involved, the same oil companies will do the distributing and refining. The royalties involved will go to either the State treasuries or the United States Treasury. Recently perfected processes for extracting oil from the enormous shale deposits of the West defer indefinitely the question of a possible oil shortage, even if atomic energy does not catch up and outmode the whole controversy.

With the trend now in the direction of strengthening the States, as the sovereign building blocks of a sovereign union, it is just as logical for Texas or California to control the off-shore oil as it is for New York State to share with Ontario in the development of St. Lawrence hydroelectric power. Mr. Truman let himself be steered into accepting the tidelands oil as a political issue by the late Harold Ickes who, as Secretary of the Interior, took a dim view of Ed Pauley's interest in State control of these resources.

So I cannot see any political advantage for either Democrats or for Mr. Truman's somewhat under-populated place in history in any last-minute attempt to foul up the Eisenhower administration on the tidelands issue. At best it would be only a minor obstacle placed in the path of the incoming Republican outfit; at worst it could resemble the attempts of the Buchanan administration, after Lincoln's election, to accept secession and surrender Fort Sumter.

In either case, an Executive order placing this oil under the Navy would be of no particular force, since it could promptly be set aside by another Executive order and the question referred back to the political decision of November 4, 1952.

Labor's Role in Our Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1953

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address delivered by Mr. George Lederman, manager of the Shochtim Union of Greater New York, Local 370, American Federation of Labor, as a part of a radio presentation of the Trades Union Council for the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America on Station WEVD, Labor Day, 1952:

LABOR'S ROLE IN OUR DEMOCRACY
(By George Lederman)

The theory behind labor organizations is quite simple. It is based on the philosophy of man's humanity to man. It is a negation of any thought or action that would array one group of individuals against another and it is in a very large sense the epitome of brotherhood.

The labor movement in this country has come to full bloom. The process—or rather the steps which have brought about the evolution of labor from an unorganized and helpless segment of our population have proceeded through many decades and are now part of economic, social, and political history. Labor has taken its place with management and is now an integral part of our American way of life. It was not always so. For the conflicts of the past have been bitter and stubborn. But the fact that labor has emerged as one of the partners in American industry speaks well for the sound and common sense of the American people.

It is not my purpose to dwell on the grievances of labor in the past. I do not wish to argue how deep these grievances were and how they were ultimately resolved in favor of either labor or management. I am sure that there is no malice in the heart of the laboring man, nor does he wish that management be penalized for what he regards as unfairness in the days gone by.

However, I think that it should be pointed out that the path that labor had to follow in striving toward its goal was rough and at times heartbreaking before it attained its place in the sun.

Precisely, what has labor sought and what is it seeking? Is it acquisition of great wealth? Or the absorption of our economic system? Certainly not any of these. The history of the American labor movement dissipates any of these charges that the worker is greedy or selfish.

The essence of the whole labor movement indicates that it is creative by its nature. It abhors anything that is destructive and welcomes that which is constructive. Labor is a very essential part of the creative process that has made this country so powerful and great.

What has labor sought for its work? Unless I am greatly mistaken it has only asked in return an opportunity to have a decent home, lead a dignified family life, give its children an education, and contribute to the social advancement of our form of society. I think that you will grant me that labor asks for no unreasonable compensation and that it holds out its arms to all mankind in a spirit of sincere and wholehearted cooperation. Now what has management asked of labor? It has from time to time asked for unqualified willingness of labor to give full productivity. To this I wish to register an exception; I need only point to the period covered by World War I and World War II. There was no question of hours; there was no discussion about the rights of labor; there was no debate over what should be done and what should not be done. The simple fact remains that production was more than quadrupled because the man in the factory, and I might even say the thousands of women at his side, went all out in their determination to keep a steady flow to the battlefields of Europe and Africa.

The men and women of the American labor movement are loyal citizens because they appreciate that it is here that the voice of labor speaks freely, that it need not fear censorship, that its right will not be trampled on by dictatorship, that it will not be halted by any particular group when it seeks to carry out its program. Just as business has organized for a common purpose through chambers of commerce, manufacturers' associations, and boards of trade, so labor felt that it, too, could function better through associations of groups or unions, to project its ideas relating to the welfare of the worker. There can be no sound argument against a labor union because there is no logical reason for objections to the organization of groups of a particular industry or industry in general.

It seems to me that there is no reasonable obstacle to a free and full discussion of differences that arise from time to time between labor and management. There is no problem that cannot be solved to the mutual satisfaction of both parties, if men are willing to talk to each other honestly and sincerely across the table in a spirit of tolerance and understanding.

Unfortunately, this was not always the case. I recall with a feeling that almost borders on agony when the sweatshop was one of the symbols of man's inhumanity to man. Those were the days when men toiled under conditions that were incredible, but they certainly existed and for years nothing was done about it. I remember when young girls worked in shops that were so unsanitary that they defy description and when safety conditions were such that human life was meaningless. To understand this, all we need to do is recall the infamous Triangle Waist fire, when scores of girls met horrible death because their escape from the flames was barred by locked doors at the exit. It was not so long ago that child labor was a very common thing in this country. In the textile mills in New England and those in the South, children at the tender age of 9 and 10 worked at the loom which produced millions of yards of cloth sold all over the world.

Human lives were not treated as such. They were mere commodities, and the value that was placed on them presented the same basis of calculation that was used for iron and steel and cotton and woolen goods. It is interesting to note at this point that Judge Elbert Gary, who was chairman of the United States Steel Corp., insisted that the industry must be maintained on a two-shift basis. He insisted that the industry would be ruined if any other working schedule were put into effect. Stop and think a moment what it means for a human being to stand over a blazing-hot blast furnace for 12 straight hours. Sounds inhuman, doesn't it? But still Judge Gary asserted that the two-shift system was the very lifeblood of the steel industry.

It took many years and many sacrifices on the part of labor to convince Judge Gary and his associate members of the board of directors of the United States Steel Corp. that his notion of how human beings should work was not quite in keeping with the concepts of decent living. The judge was finally convinced, however, when the two-shift system was ultimately abolished and a three-shift system was inaugurated, that he was completely in error. The United States Steel Corp., with its three-shift system, grew into the greatest producer of steel in the history of the world. It has made enormous profits because it swerved slowly but surely from the side of oppression to the side of understanding and decency.

What does this all add up to? Simply this, that in the word of the old maxim, "Labor is worthy of its hire," is truer than ever. Let us not, however, make the mistake that labor is a commodity. The worker is a human being who lives and loves and has children and seeks a small share of the bounties of nature which are so plentiful in this country. He is happy with his lot in life, if he feels that his employer gives him a decent and honest return for his services.

In a broad sense, we are all workers, just as we are all children of God. Whether we stand at the blast furnace in the steel mill, or at the cotton loom, or sit in the office at a desk, we perform a service.

All of us should respect the dignity of labor. It awakens the creative impulses in us. It gives to life itself a meaning of vitality—and without it there would be chaos and civilization would perish from the earth. Labor unions are nothing more than an articulate and combined expression of men who labor in a free competative system to secure certain human and humane rights to which they are justly entitled.

It is encouraging to note that management has come to the realization that labor is a component of the American economic system and cannot be ignored, but must be treated with reasonable consideration. The strides that have been made since the Wagner Act are now matters of record. True, there had been differences of opinion and no doubt differences will arise in the future, but this is one of the healthy signs of our democracy. It means, above all things, that American Labor is not required to be mute. It can speak its mind without fear of a purge or a concentration camp. It can proclaim its rights from the housetops. And whether these ideas meet approval or not, vigorous voice is given to them, so that all may hear and read. How different from the position of labor in the U. S. S. R. and their satellites. In this country we have, thank God, free labor and in the sphere of communism they have slave labor.

Editorial Comment on the Subject of Senator Morse's Committee Status in the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1953

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three editorials dealing with the subject of my committee status in the Senate of the United States. The first is an editorial entitled "Senator MORSE's Ability More Valuable Than a Label," published in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot; the second, an editorial entitled "The Choice Is Ours," published in the Citizen-Advertiser, of Auburn, N. Y.; and the third, an editorial entitled "Old Guard Victory," published in the

Just one or two more facts in this particular matter. The United States quota was evidently established by the Council of the Organization of American States. Now 15 states have ratified the Charter of this organization; in other words, the United States is 1 of 15 members of this organization. And yet we contribute 7 out of every 10 dollars received by the organization. Does this seem logical or right?

For the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, the United States last year contributed $153,480, or 77.9 percent of the total. A footnote in the State Department publication explains this as due to the fact that only 11 out of 21 American states have accepted membership in this organization. Over the last 4 years, our contributions to this organization have averaged nearly 79 percent of the total received, or a total figure during that period of almost $600,000.

In this case, quotas are supposed to be fixed in proportion to population by the board of directors of the Institute, which is identical in personnel with the Council of the Organization of American States. Apparently the United States has 79 percent of the population of the member states of this organization.

Last fiscal year the United States contributed to the Pan American Sanitary Organization $1,355,329, or 69.73 percent of the total. Over the last 4 years we have contributed a total amount of nearly $5 million to this organization and our contributions have averaged more than 71 percent of the total. The quotas for the members were assessed on the same basis as for the Pan American Union which I have already mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the total amounts of these contributions which I am calling to question but what appears to be the grossly disproportionate part played by the United States. In the examples of the three organizations which I have mentioned, the United States in the last fiscal year alone has been carrying nearly 72 percent of the entire financial load and in earlier years it has been considerably higher.

Now I would like to turn from the question of assessed budgets to the matter of some special programs which are financed by voluntary contributions on the part of this and other governments. The first is the pledge of $11,400,000 to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance, representing approximately 60 percent of the total pledged. In other words, even though pledges have come from 65 countries, we are giving $3 out of every $5 that are contributed. I might also note, incidentally, that funds for this voluntary contribution were contained in the Mutual Security Appropriation Act for fiscal 1952. In fiscal 1951, we spent more than $12 million in this direction.

On behalf of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, we actually contributed $10 million during fiscal 1952, but we have pledged $162,500,000, which represents 65 percent of the total target budget. I understand that this pledge has not yet received congressional approval. However, more than $50 million have so far been appropriated for contribution to this agency.

In the matter of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, $50 million were pledged and appropriated for fiscal 1952, of which thirty million have actually been paid. Our pledge has been 61 percent of the total and we have volunteered to go as high as 70 percent of the total contributions made by all governments. In fiscal 1951 we contributed well over $25 million for this purpose.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I am not challenging the size of these various contributions, even though they total nearly $75 million in the six examples I have mentioned. I am certainly not challenging the purposes for which they were contributed as all of these international organizations have a very definite and often praiseworthy purpose. But I do protest most vigorously against the fact that this sum of $75 million contributed to half a dozen international organizations constitute on an average better than two-thirds of the entire contributions received by these organizations from all states contributing thereto. In other words, in these examples, the United States is paying $2 out of every $3 received by these organizations.

There are other examples where the disproportion, while not so great, is still evident. We pay nearly 40 percent of the cost of the United Nations. We pay 30 percent of the cost of the Food and Agricultural Organization. We pay nearly 40 percent of the cost of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, more popularly known as UNESCO. And we pay nearly 40 percent of the cost of the World Health Organization.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the above facts speak for themselves. I wish to conclude by saying that if we are going to continue our memberships in many of these international organizations, it is my firm belief that we should insist and demand that the other member governments make a more proportionate share of the total contributions. If this cannot be done, I believe, for the good of the long-suffering American taxpayer, we should consider whether or not our participation in such organizations is bringing to us a share of the benefits which is equal to our financial contributions in such cases. There is no obligation on our part to maintain the principle of international organization and cooperation when it requires that our people make financial contributions out of all proportion to the benefits that we receive.

Title to Lands Beneath Navigable Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1953

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed legislation purporting to "confirm and establish" the title of the States to the lands beneath the navigable waters is a Pandora's box which will open up the reserves of natural resources of the Government of the United States, particularly in the so-called public-land States, to the private destruction, exploitation, and waste which is characterized by the earlier developments of the eastern part of the United States. This legislation, if enacted, is merely a preview to future demands that all the mineral resources and other reserves, including the national forests, the public lands, the Indian lands, and even the reserve rights-of-way granted to transcontinental railroads by the Federal Government, shall be made available to the States or to private individuals for exploitation or disposition. No Federal holding will be too large or too small to escape such demands.

These reserved oil resources beneath the marginal seas constitute part of a huge public trust held by the Federal Government in the interest of all the people of the United States. There is no more impelling reason why these oil resources should be given to the bordering States than other reserve natural resources. They are enormously valuable. It has been stated that in addition to approximately 235,000,000 barrels of oil already recovered from these lands, it is estimated that more than 2,500,000,000 additional barrels may be discovered in the submerged lands that would be given away by the legislation to the States of California, Texas, and Louisiana. Royalties from such oil could bring huge revenues into the Treasury of the United States even under existing law. In addition to the oil and gas, other mineral resources of great value may be discovered and developed beneath these ocean beds. Further, these resources exist in areas of the Continental Shelf, in the Atlantic Ocean, Gulf of Mexico, and Pacific Ocean approximating 185,800,000 acres.

Oil resources are vital to the national defense. Now that almost every vessel and machine of the Navy, Army, Air Force, Coast Guard, and merchant marine is driven by oil or its byproducts, the powers conferred by the Constitution of the United States "to raise and support armies * * * to provide and maintain a Navy * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States" can best be exercised only with an assurance of an adequate supply of this vital resource. Serious depletion or extinction of the oil resources would be a national tragedy. It cannot be emphasized too greatly that a strong national defense is essential to the maintenance of the Government of the United States in its present capacity as a leading member of the family of nations. This capacity was specifically recognized by the Supreme Court in a California case.

The very oil about which the States and the Nation are contending might well become the subject of an international dispute and settlement. Only the Government of the United States would be constitutionally competent to effect such a settlement. The constitutionality of this "give-away oil program" could be successfully challenged because under the Constitution no State has the right to enter into a treaty with a foreign power.

Just before ex-President Truman left office he issued an Executive order transferring the so-called tidelands oil area from the Interior Department to the Navy Department. It may be as proponents of this "give-away oil program" have said, that Mr. Truman was playing politics and was setting up a booby trap for the incoming administration. Perhaps, and for this reason I hope the incoming administration does not step on the booby trap. However, it should be kept in mind that it was the Navy that initiated and sponsored the movement to determine ownership of offshore oil, because the Navy considered this oil vital to security. The Supreme Court said, when the question reached it in 1947, that the United States has full domination of all marginal seas. Thus the Executive order would do no more than dedicate what belongs to the country to its defense.

I like to call my shots as I see them, and I've got to call this one a double A for Mr. Truman. His Executive order, still in effect, dramatizes for the American people the significance of these tremendously valuable oil assets and their need for national defense.

It is noteworthy also that President Eisenhower made no mention of this subject in his state of the Union message. Such omission is encouraging indeed. To upset the present status of these assets would strike a great moral blow at the necessary confidence that must be maintained at home to insure a positive foreign policy abroad.

It Was Once Insisted That We Join in Financing Canada's Welland Canal; Now It Is the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1953

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, grim predictions have been and are being made by advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway project should Congress continue to refuse approval for participation by the United States in constructing and financing the so-called International Ditch.

The following news release dated January 29, 1953, was issued by the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, a Nation-wide organization opposed to the construction of such an economic monstrosity.

The news release will tend to refresh the memory of many who will have little difficulty in recalling the propaganda that was circulated about 30 years ago when the Welland Canal was modernized and when it was hoped that the United States might be induced to share in the cost of the modernization program.

The news release is as follows:

IT WAS ONCE INSISTED THAT WE BUY INTO CANADA'S WELLAND CANAL

There is nothing new in the present insistence of the St. Lawrence waterway proponents that we must join with Canada in the work in the International Rapids of the St. Lawrence River or forever be at that country's mercy.

Thirty years ago it was being insisted that we join with Canada in the construction of the Welland Canal. We didn't do it and we haven't experienced the slightest inconvenience.

The Welland Canal, first built by Canada 100 years ago, presumably to compete with the then Erie, now the New York State Barge Canal, connects Lake Ontario and Lake Erie. Any vessel passing upstream through the International Rapids must pass through the Welland Canal in order to get into the Great Lakes. It would seem that we have been at the mercy of Canada for 100 years.

Work on modernization of the canal was begun about 1922. Newspaper clippings of the time show that Representative Chalmers, of Toledo, introduced a bill in Congress providing that we share the cost of this work with Canada. The bill also provided for the St. Lawrence waterway. The agitation then, as now, was that if we didn't join in with Canada, that Government would own the canal and apply what tolls it saw fit to apply.

Well, sir, it's a funny thing, bearing on the claim now that tolls will make the project self-liquidating and that Canada would manipulate these tolls to our disadvantage—it's a funny thing, but tolls on the Welland Canal were repealed in 1903. Traffic through it had about dried up. There are now certain handling charges, but no tolls designed to pay for the cost of the project.

Out at the Soo Locks, between Lakes Huron and Superior, another essential link in the proposed waterway, we make no charges of any kind. Canadian grain boats use them freely on their way down through the Welland Canal to the other side of Lake Ontario.

Yet the proponents of the waterway in this country are insisting that if we don't do the work in the International Rapids, to the east of the Welland Canal, we will regret it for the rest of our lives. It simply doesn't make sense.

These proponents have now dropped, temporarily, the plan of a waterway out to Duluth. Under the measures now being sponsored by Representative DONDERO in the House, and Senator WILEY and other Senators, $100,000,000 would be tossed out to do the navigation work in the International Rapids section alone, notwithstanding that Canada is pledged to do it if disposition is made of the question of the international power plant in the Rapids. The proposal of Messrs. DONDERO, WILEY, et al. would have the effect of extending a 27-foot waterway only to Toledo.

It would be obsolete for oceangoing vessels before a spadeful of dirt had been turned, but there would be just as much of an accomplishment with Canada doing the work. Why should we not show the same restraint which we used in the Welland Canal agitation 30 years ago?

Still the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1953

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Toccoa (Ga.) Record of January 29, 1953:

STILL THE WELFARE STATE

Americans are characteristically humanitarian. They are known the world over for this trait. Friends and enemies alike take advantage of it. It has been a complicating element in our relations with the Communists—they confuse it with softness. And right here in our own country our humanitarian instincts often lead us astray.

An excellent recent example involves the report of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation. Not long ago when the report was released many of the country's leading publications, after a cursory glance, headlined it as a boon to the country. The introduction to the report is a masterly appeal to the humanitarian. But in between the lines is another story, an old story.

The report recommends the expenditure of more than $2,000,000,000 of tax money. The answer proposed for the solution to almost every problem is additional Federal funds. Aside from the question of how these funds are to be raised, in the background of all these endeavors lurks the shadow of Federal control.

Health is conditioned by food, housing, and education, so that the report advances the old argument that control of all these factors as well as health measures per se should come under the direction of an all-wise Federal Government. In other words, without naming it the report has described the welfare state.

We are all interested in the steady improvement of health and medical care. However, the experience of other nations, especially Great Britain, has shown that good medical care and health cannot necessarily be bought at a given price. Here in our own country, ever since the founding of the Nation, we have had continuous and in late years spectacular growth in both living standards and medical achievements. These great advances have been a normal development in a land where people are free to pursue their chosen occupations and live their lives without interference from government. Whenever government interferes, progress stops. And in the last analysis, every health proposal that has so far been submitted for Federal legislative action would mean abandoning the way of freedom and adopting the old-world philosophy that government can do for us better than we can do for ourselves.

This philosophy is a dead-end road at the end of which lies servitude. When confronted with such a philosophy, no matter how attractively presented, the American people must not let their humanitarian instincts betray them.

Widespread Support for Bill Which Would Make Railroad Cars Visible at Night to Approaching Motorists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1953

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in a further attempt to reduce the slaughter of human lives at railroad grade crossings, particularly in rural areas where there are no street lights, I have introduced in the House another bill which would require that railroad cars be equipped with reflective or luminous material so

The Long Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1953

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I present here an outstanding editorial from the New York Times for February 9, 1953, again urging the Congress to grant statehood to Alaska. It is especially interesting to note that the Times calls attention to the fact that during the campaign President Eisenhower advocated statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska.

ALASKA WAITS HER TURN

Whether the present Congress and administration will give us two new States, or one new State, or no new State is uncertain. The Republican platform promised immediate statehood for Hawaii and statehood for Alaska under an equitable enabling act. The suspicion was that an excuse would be found to postpone Alaskan statehood. General Eisenhower, during his campaign, went beyond this device, if such it was. He advocated the quick admission of both Alaska and Hawaii. Last Tuesday, in his message on the state of the Union, he still urged the admission of Hawaii but said nothing about Alaska.

We have no reason to question the President's good faith. What he is now advocating is probably what he thinks this Congress at this session will accept. But it would be ingenuous for anybody to believe that the reasons usually advanced against Alaskan statehood at this time, inadequate population, pioneer stage of development, need for more experience in self-government, etc., are the really compelling ones. Self-interest, political and economic, inside and outside the Territory, plays a lively part. All the arguments, the honest and the hypocritical, the overt and the hidden, are a poor excuse for keeping even 150,000 Americans in the status of second-class citizens, getting second-class treatment from absentee legislators.

Alaska's population today is not much less than that of Nevada. Under the drive of defense installations and the speeded-up development of resources, especially minerals, the Territory is bound to grow. And certainly a community which is not allowed to govern itself makes a poor example for the non-self-governing communities not so far off across Bering Sea and Bering Strait.

The Texas Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1953

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to point out that the right of Texas to her submerged lands is based firmly on statutory law dating back to December 19, 1836. And all the facts bearing on this matter have been so long a matter of public knowledge that there should be no appreciable further delay in enacting legislation to restore these so-called tidelands to their rightful owner—the State of Texas.

This right has been approved by the vote of past Democratic Congresses and has been promised the support of President Eisenhower. Furthermore, the position of Texas in this matter is particularly incontrovertible because of the clear language of the treaty by which the Republic of Texas became a part of the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Sunday, February 8, edition of the Beaumont Enterprise:

WHY STUDY OFFSHORE LANDS?

One of the so-called tidelands bills pending in Congress would create a special commission to study the offshore oil problem. This measure is a palpable attempt to gain time and postpone final action.

Those who want the Federal Government to rob the coastal States of their submerged lands know Congress is ready to again pass a bill giving the States title to these lands, and that when the bill reaches President Eisenhower's desk he will sign it, thereby keeping a campaign promise.

So the advocates of Federal seizure of the States' offshore lands resort to a device as old as Congress itself. They would set up a commission to study something that has been thoroughly studied already.

Congress has no more need of a commission to study the tidelands issue and make recommendations, most of which probably would be either impracticable or objectionable, than it needs to spend more days, weeks, months, and years studying the St. Lawrence seaway.

Even so, the Senate Interior Committee announces it will open a hearing on tidelands legislation February 16. However, the head of the committee, Senator CORDON, of Oregon, inferentially promises not to prolong the hearing by saying it will be limited to the presentation of new or supplemental material.

As an outstanding example of the evidence that Texas' claims have received wide support from authoritative and impartial observers, I also include the following excerpts from a column in the New York Times of last October 16 by the distinguished Washington correspondent, Arthur Krock:

Nothing in the [Supreme Court] decisions questioned the right of Congress to quitclaim Federal title to these submerged areas. * * *

* * * State title to these lands * * * was not questioned by Washington for a hundred years and only was assailed when the petroleum yield and the prospect of more became valuable. But the fact is that [the States'] position has a large share of history, law, and common sense behind it, and, in the instance of Texas, public morals, too. * * *

The Louisiana case was decided on the same reasoning as that of California. But to apply its rule to Texas the Supreme Court majority was obliged to resort to an extreme form of legal casuistry and override the fact that two sovereigns—the Texas Republic and the United States—signed a treaty agreement that, if the Republic would assume its debts after annexation, the United States would make no claim of title to Texas' [public lands]. In these the submerged areas from low-water mark to the end of the State's historic boundaries were included from the beginning.

Widespread War Launched Against TVA by Power Trust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1953

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Florence Times (Ala.) of January 7, 1953. This article is worthy of the close attention of every Member.

WIDESPREAD WAR LAUNCHED AGAINST TVA BY POWER TRUST

There is an old saying about eternal vigilance being the price of liberty and from the looks of our mail in recent days we would suspect that eternal vigilance is also the price of reasonable electric power rates.

First to hit our desk, with an accompanying letter, was a slick brochure from none other than Purcell L. Smith, president of the National Association of Electric Companies, entitled "Turn on the Light."

After reading it we came definitely to the conclusion that Mr. Smith, who is the Nation's chief power trust lobbyist, should have entitled his booklet Turn on the Propaganda.

The accompanying letter read:

"It isn't always an easy task to explain the complex problems of the electric power industry without getting bogged down in a morass of complicated details.

"We feel, however, that the enclosed booklet, Turn on the Light, clearly defines the electric power industry's basic position on the generation and distribution of power produced by the Federal Government, and that it does so without unnecessary complications.

"Whether or not you feel as we do on the issue of Government production of electric power in competition with private industry, we are confident you will want the facts of the case. Or, as the booklet says, '* * * it is important that you—the final arbiter in our society—should know exactly what the controversy is all about'."

Hardly had we digested the power-trust booklet before an editorial from the New York Sunday News hit our desk, entitled "Let's Sell a Lot of Properties." Of course, the main thing they wanted to sell was TVA. And to whom? You guessed it, the power trust.

The editorial ran as follows:

"Charles E. (General Electric) Wilson months ago proposed that one of the biggest of all these things, the Tennessee Valley Authority, be sold to private stockholders in exchange for United States bonds.

"That would cut down the national debt substantially, and set the TVA to making money for its patriotic new owners instead of charging any deficits to the taxpayers.

"Other Government properties could be similarly sold off, we think, with benefit to all concerned except a bunch of bureaucrats who would lose their jobs or have to work harder.

"There is even a suggestion floating around that the Government be forced to sell the deficit-champ Post Office to private purchasers if any can be found.

"That might be a bit extreme. But with the idea of taking the Government out of competition with private enterprise wherever possible, we're in full sympathy. Congress can't get busy too soon on this task to suit us.

islature have now been fully realized. Far from giving the citizens of New York the protection that they had reasonably expected from the State legislature, they now find themselves the helpless victims of an announced intention to allow rent increases which may well spell ruination of countless families in the middle and related groups of income.

The Republican Party has once again demonstrated that it only gives lip service to the needs of the people. Upon investigation, I have found that there is a continued extreme shortage in housing for low- and middle-income groups. The New York Real Estate Board in a survey conducted in January 1953, of 85,000 apartments in New York County found less than one-half of 1 percent of vacancies and most of those in high rental brackets beyond the means of those with modest incomes. The same shortage prevails throughout the entire city. In addition, there are 30,000 families in New York City today living in cellar apartments, paying exorbitant rents, and in many instances sharing community kitchens and bathroom facilities. The New York State rent administrator himself concedes the existence and continuance of the housing emergency.

The present rent-control law of New York State is more than adequate to provide substantial profits to New York landlords. A guaranteed return of 4 percent of total assessed valuation of the property is given to the owner regardless of the amount of his investment, and this after deduction and allowance of all operating expenses plus 2 percent for depreciation. While the 4-percent formula may be called the floor or base, the sky is the limit as reflected by brokers' listings of multiple dwellings which show profits of 20 to 30 percent and more annually on investments. Furthermore, records indicate that approximately 12,500 voluntary leases sanctioned by the statute, providing for 15-percent increase have been initiated since the inception of the New York State rent-control law and a like number of monthly increases allowed by the State Rent Administrator for increased services. Finally, the present law excludes from control all new housing since February 1, 1947.

We are laboring familiar words, but nontheless forceful, that shelter is one of the primary and basic necessities of life, and during the period of the emergency, rents for housing accommodations should be continued to be stabilized, regulated, and strictly controlled in order to prevent unreasonable and unwarranted evictions which would inevitably adversely affect the public health, safety, and general welfare of the people. Our vast number of Government employees, including civil service, postal, white collar, and many laboring classes, earning modest fixed incomes and also many others, whose sole source of income is derived from annuities and pension, will be subjected to the greatest hardship and distress if the Republican plan for increased rents is effected. The Bureau of Labor statistics index in its latest survey, discloses that New York City families expend the second highest amount, percentagewise in the country, of their income, to wit 22 percent for rents.

The actions of Soviet Russia and its satellites throughout the world, leave us no alternative but to take necessary steps to insure our national defense. One of the vital ramparts of that defense is taking proper care of the basic needs of our citizens here at home so that they can produce the needed goods and services so essential for our fighting men abroad.

One of their essential needs is shelter—decent housing at a fair price that they can afford to pay. They should be protected against rent gouging. Like the rest of the Nation, New York faces a rent crisis, and the people need help.

The Oil Rush of '53

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1953

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the New Republic of March 2, 1953, by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, Mr. HILL, is most apropos.

I commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

THE OIL RUSH OF '53
(By LISTER HILL)

If invading armies were poised off the coasts of the United States to plunder the rich oil deposits under those waters, the entire Nation would be mobilized to repel the seizure. Today the American people stand in very real danger of losing billions of dollars of undersea oil reserves, but not from foreign armies with cocked guns. The danger lies in the efforts of California, Texas, and Louisiana—backed by big oil interests—to take for themselves vast oil wealth under the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico.

The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled three times—once in 1947 and twice in 1950—that these oil-rich submerged coastal lands beyond the low-tide mark (going out to sea as far as 150 miles into the Gulf in some places) belong to the United States as a whole—that is, to all the people of the 48 States—and are not the property of the three adjoining States. Yet the Senate and the House will soon vote on bills to overrule the Supreme Court and have the Nation give away 16 million acres or more of oil-rich undersea lands to the three States—to the exclusion of the other 45 States.

The oil lobbyists around Capitol Hill are confident of passage of the oil-grab measure by the Republican Congress (after all, Democratic Congresses passed similar bills twice before), and they only hope their presence will speed action. This time there will be no Harry Truman to veto the measures.

Never have measures before Congress been so misrepresented as these so-called tidelands oil bills. The very name "tidelands" is a misrepresentation, for actually the tidelands were not involved in any way in the legislation, just as they were not involved in the Supreme Court decisions. The tidelands properly described are those narrow strips of land along the coast that are regularly covered and uncovered by the tides; that is, the lands between the points of high and low tide. The tidelands belong to the individual States and always have. So also do the States hold undisputed title to the beds of inland waters such as rivers, bays, harbors, and lakes, including the Great Lakes, and to harbor facilities like piers, docks, and jetties.

I do not believe the American people want Congress to overrule our highest Court and give away their national inheritance as is proposed by several quitclaim bills now up for consideration. The question that should concern Congress is not how to give the oil and gas away, but how to keep it and use it in the national interest. This vast national patrimony belongs to the people of the entire Nation and must be used for their benefit and the benefit of succeeding generations.

For this reason, 22 of us in the Senate are sponsoring legislation to defeat this attempted grab of national property and save it for the school children of America. Our proposal is known as the oil for education amendment. It would dedicate the royalties from the oil and gas to urgent national defense needs and as a perpetual endowment for grammar schools, high schools, and colleges throughout the Nation—in every one of the 48 States. This is the same wise policy that our Nation has followed since the very beginning—a policy of using our public-lands resources to promote education.

The ordinances of 1785 and 1787 and the Morrill Act of 1862—signed into law by the Republican Party's own Abraham Lincoln—and other acts of Congress have granted millions of acres of our public lands to the States for the establishment and support of schools and colleges. The challenge to this generation is that we have the wisdom to use our new public lands under the sea to give to that system the high standards of quality that Jefferson, Madison, Lincoln, and other statesmen of our early history envisioned.

Our measure is exceedingly generous to the coastal States in allocating to them 37.5 percent of the revenues deriving from lands under the sea within the 3-mile limit. Our amendment deals with the balance of the revenues—62.5 percent within the 3-mile limit and 100 percent beyond the 3-mile limit going out to sea. The provisions of the amendment are simple:

1. The money from this oil is to be dedicated now for the long-range needs of the education of the Nation's children and placed in a special account in the Treasury of the United States. During the present critical period, the funds may be used for national defense purposes. They shall be employed only for urgent developments to be specifically determined by the Congress. Thereafter, this special account shall be devoted to our children's education as grants-in-aid to primary, secondary, and higher education.

2. Every State or political subdivision which has issued any mineral leases or grants covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, and every grantee of such State or political subdivision shall file with the Attorney General of the United States by December 31, 1953, a statement of the money or other things of value received by the State from such leases or grants. The Attorney General must submit those statements to Congress not later than February 1, 1954. The object of this provision is to find out what benefit particular States have already had from this property which belongs to all the people.

There is no need to emphasize the deplorable conditions that exist in our educational system—dilapidated schools, many of which are overcrowded, the alarming shortage of teachers, underpaid and overworked. And now, while we are facing a national need for more teachers, scientists, engineers, doctors, and agriculturists, our colleges and universities are in dire financial trouble. Now that the scholarship aid to World War II veterans is coming to an end, colleges are suffering their most severe financial crisis of all times.

The opportunity which our undersea oil wealth offers to education is seen in a resolution passed by the Arizona House of Representatives on February 9, calling on Congress to adopt the oil-for-education amendment. I hope that other State legislatures will be quick to follow Arizona's lead. We could strengthen and revitalize American education with this new $50 billion endowment.

Geologists estimate that there are at least 15 billion barrels of oil under the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf. At the going price of around $2.70 per barrel, this adds up to over $40 billion. In addition, there is natural gas worth $10 billion or more. I have frequently told my colleagues in the Senate that adoption of the oil-for-education amendment would be like placing an oil well on every school and college campus in the United States.

Today the Government has a huge debt. Taxpayers are carrying heavy burdens. Here is oil money for schools without taxes—a windfall for easing the financial straits of our elementary and secondary schools. Here is a bonanza for relieving the agonizing difficulties of colleges and universities, medical schools, dental schools, nursing schools and research institutions by techniques such as scholarships and grants-in-aid for specific training and research projects. The possibilities challenge the imagination.

To my sore disappointment, President Eisenhower during the campaign last fall told the people of Texas, California, and Louisiana that he would sign the kind of bill that Truman vetoed. With all due respect to the President, I must express the earnest hope that Congress never gives him the chance.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1953

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Republican-controlled New York State Legislature has just announced its intention to increase the rents of tenants in New York. The Republican Party has once again demonstrated that it only gives lip service to the needs of the people.

Upon investigation, it has been found that there is a continued extreme shortage in housing for low and middle income groups. Thousands of families in the Bronx are living on relatively low fixed incomes which have not kept pace with the rising costs of living. Because of the housing shortage, many of them are already paying high rents for quarters which are far from desirable.

Adequate low-cost housing is just not available. The proposed 15 percent rent increase would be exorbitant and result in a personal tragedy for the families affected.

The present rent-control law of New York State is more than adequate to provide substantial profits to New York landlords. A guaranteed return of 4 percent of total assessed valuation of the property is given to the owner regardless of the amount of his investment, and this after deduction and allowance of all operating expenses plus 2 percent for depreciation. While the 4-percent formula may be called the floor or base, the sky is the limit, as reflected by brokers' listings of multiple dwellings which show profits of 20 to 30 percent and more annually on investments. Furthermore, records indicate that approximately 12,500 voluntary leases monthly, sanctioned by the statute, providing for 15-percent increases, have been initiated since the inception of the New York State rent-control law and a like number of monthly increases allowed by the State rent administrator for increased service. Finally, the present law excludes from control all new housing since February 1, 1947.

Shelter is one of the basic necessities of life, and during this period of emergency rents for housing accommodations should continue to be stabilized, regulated, and controlled. One of the vital ramparts of our defense structure is taking proper care of the basic needs of our citizens here at home so that they can produce the needed goods and services so essential for our fighting men abroad.

The people need decent housing at a fair price that they can afford to pay. This is not the time for an across-the-board rent increase. I am going to do all I can to help the people in the fight to maintain rent control.

Taft-Hartley Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1953

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a statement I made before the House Committee on Education and Labor on February 18, 1953:

Mr. RHODES. My name is GEORGE M. RHODES, Representative in Congress from the 14th Pennsylvania District.

I appear before the committee today in support of H. R. 2511, which I introduced and which I believe will rectify some of the unfair and unjust provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

This measure including another which I will introduce today will permit any type of union security clause which parties to labor-management agreements negotiate, including the closed shop.

It would, also, provide that such union security agreements shall be legal, nothwithstanding any State antiunion security legislation.

The purpose of this amendment is to leave unions and management free to negotiate whatever union-security agreement they deem best in their particular situation. It would eliminate unnecessary and unwise Government restrictions.

I believe the employer and union involved are the best judges of what is best in a given situation and should be left free to negotiate such agreements as they see fit.

Another important aspect of this amendment would be to prohibit State legislatures from adopting anticlosed shop or antiunion shop laws and having them take precedence over the Federal law.

Taft-Hartley invites the States to pass tougher antiunion laws than the Congress did. That is not only contrary to the general principle of law, which has Federal law taking priority, but it is inconsistent. For, in another provision, Taft-Hartley says States cannot permit supervisors to enjoy collective bargaining because the Federal law denies it to them.

Actually, what Congress did was to urge States to be tough on unions but forbade them to treat unions better than the Congress did.

I would modify the provision covering secondary boycotts and would eliminate the injunction in labor-management disputes. I am convinced that adoption of this amendment would remove some of the basic inequities of Taft-Hartley and operate in the public interest. It certainly would help in treating labor with the justice and fairness President Eisenhower promised.

While H. R. 2511 pertains only to employers and employees in the printing industry, I believe that this proposal should be made to cover all industry. I intend to introduce a broad union and closed-shop bill today which also would have Federal law protect union security against antiunion State legislation.

My appearance here today is to urge these changes, not simply because it would be fair to labor, but because I believe it means so very much to the welfare, the unity, and strength of our Nation.

Nothing is more important to all Americans today than national unity. Unity and a recognition of our common interests is essential if we are to effectively combat communism and all brands of totalitarian tyranny.

I am encouraged because many supporters of Taft-Hartley now recognize some of the injustices in the law and agree that changes are necessary in the interest of fairness and in promoting a better relationship between labor and management.

Most encouraging to me is the attitude of the chairman of your committee, Mr. MCCONNELL, who represents a neighboring district in Pennsylvania and for whom I have a high regard and a deep feeling of respect and confidence.

He and I may honestly disagree on some of the provisions in this law, but I am in full accord with the views he expressed recently in regard to the question of improving the law. I especially like the spirit of fairness and sincerity in which he said:

"The rights of the people, the wage earner, the employer, and the union must be protected, blended, and balanced as well as is humanly possible in any law. The responsibilities must go hand-in-hand with rights and privileges. And last, but by no means least, interference by the Federal Government and its agencies in the relations of labor and management should be kept to a minimum."

Mr. Chairman, if that is to be the sentiment of your committee, and of the Congress, I know that substantial improvements will be made. In that case it would be well to change the name of the bill. I believe I know the sentiment of labor unionists today. A McConnell bill reflecting his attitude and opinion would inspire confidence where there is now suspicion and distrust. President Eisenhower said that the law should be free from taint and suspicion that it is partial or punitive. Here is a way it can be done.

But I am not to optimistic about what this Congress will do, and it certainly would not be fair to the chairman to have his name on a new law, if it contained so many of the unjust provisions of the present act.

Much has been said in favor of repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. I do not make such a request, as I believe that what is most important is the kind of changes that are made. If enough changes are made it will be a new law.

However, I am not impressed by some Members of Congress who contend that it would not be good sense to repeal the law. I say this because they are inconsistent.

This plan could offer the base for a coordinated attack, and yet not rule out the special appeals or arguments of any one philosophy or religion. A program could be carried out through Government agencies or private groups.

Such an educational program, if successful, might weaken the determinism of the Communists, make them a bit tolerant. Also, it might bring about a face-to-face meeting of ideas which could result in a synthesis of the West and Russian communism, or, at least, a workable agreement to disagree.

An attack on the philosophical basis of communism might have other benefits. A strong comparison of western philosophy with Soviet communism might indirectly solve other East-West tensions which have nothing to do with communism, which started as a western philosophy. Comparative philosophy is an approach used by some eastern and western thinkers, including the new journal, Philosophy East and West, of the University of Hawaii, edited by Charles A. Moore. Another approach is found in the epistemological concepts of F. S. C. Northrop, who was mentioned previously.

Russia has spent billions on propaganda. Spreading its intellectual ideas is usually its first step in taking over a country. Why shouldn't we reply in kind? Tell the Russians about the West, but also tell them about the philosophy of communism—and its errors. How many Communists know what philosophical communism really is, or, if they do, have had a chance to understand another viewpoint or way of life?

FORD FOUNDATION SETS UP FUND FOR SURVEY OF DANGERS IN METHODS USED IN COMBATING COMMUNISM

NEW YORK, February 26.—The Ford Foundation has allocated $15 million to find out whether American civil liberties are being endangered by current methods of combating the Communist menace, it was announced yesterday.

The Fund for the Republic, an independent organization established by the foundation last year, announced it had received the appropriation on a vote by the foundation's trustees.

Paul G. Hoffman, retiring president of the Ford Foundation, was elected chairman of the board of directors of the fund, which is dedicated to the elimination of restrictions on freedom of thought, inquiry, and expression in the United States and the development of policies and procedures that can protect these rights.

REALISTIC FINDING SOUGHT

The fund's directors said they planned to "undertake research into the extent and nature of the internal Communist menace" in the United States in an effort to "arrive at a realistic understanding of effective procedures for dealing with it."

The fund's board of directors said the organization's work should be concentrated on:

1. Restrictions and assaults on academic freedom.

2. Due process and equal protection of the laws.

3. The protection of the rights of minorities.

4. Censorship, boycotting, and blacklisting activities by private groups.

5. Principles of guilt by association and its application in the United States today.

AREA OF OPERATION

The Fund for the Republic said its sphere of operation included "the entire field of freedom and civil rights in the United States." It has taken as its basic charter the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, the announcement said.

"One of the first activities to be undertaken by the fund is a thorough study into the many difficult concepts and problems which are encountered in the field of civil liberties," the announcement said.

"We saw a pressing need for a clear statement in contemporary terms of the legacy of American liberty. We propose to help restore respectability to individual freedom."

Communism and Communist influence in this country is the major factor affecting civil liberties today, the fund said.

Tidelands Oil Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1953

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum and tables:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1953.

Memorandum to: Hon. HARLAN HAGEN.

From: Charles F. Keyser, analyst, conservation and natural resources, Economics Section.

This is in reply to your letter of January 31, 1953, requesting certain information regarding the so-called tidelands oil resources.

The estimated value of United States offshore oil resources is shown in the table, No. 1, attached herewith. This table utilizes the current estimates of the United States Geological Survey and a rough equivalent of the current market price of crude oil.

You ask whether there are or are not any agencies public or private, other than the States or the Federal Government having ownership rights or something equivalent thereto in any segment of tidelands. The answer is that insofar as we have been able to determine there are no instances of any such save those that have, in the past, derived from the States. In the instance of Long Beach, Calif., with which you are no doubt familiar, the State of California, by law transferred title of the submerged waters in San Pedro Bay to the city. The Federal Government has recognized this as being within the limits of inland waters and does not question the ownership.

There are numerous instances as between the States and local governmental bodies as well as private interests, of transfer of title or rights or privileges within the tidelands and/or submerged lands. These may be found in the form of grants or leases or in other forms; for sedentary fisheries, oyster beds, removal of said oyster shells, etc., seaweed, sponges, and many others. In many instances, where there has been no interference with navigation, as determined by the Corps of Engineers there are many cases of property rights granted, or recognized by the States in filled-in peripheral areas, docks, wharves, and other structures. These mentioned above do not include mineral leases in the offshore areas which are another matter entirely.

It might be worthy of note that according to the office of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior the Federal Government has interposed no objection heretofore to the construction of pipelines from offshore natural gas wells to gathering points inshore.

A comparison of the rate of returns in terms of oil or in terms of money may be made in only very general terms. Attached herewith is a table, Oil and Gas Leases, Acreage Oil Production, Royalty Barrels and Royalty Value, Public and Acquired Lands. This table (No. 2) was prepared by the United States Geological Survey. It will give some indication of developments in oil and gas on Federal public lands. In addition thereto the Survey has prepared a table indicating the competitive leasing and bonus results on the public domain and State lease-sales. A copy of this table is attached herewith (No. 3).

For your information we are including a table (No. 4) shawing in brief, the leaving procedure of State-owned and public land.

According to the biennial reports of the State Mineral Board of Louisiana, for the years 1948 and 1949, Louisiana received $16,710,317.06 in royalties from 160 oil and gas leases, and $14,086,336.17 in rental payments on 725 leases, the total comprising 2,201,112 acres. These figures include tideland lease income. The total receipts for the biennium from bonuses, rentals, and royalties amounted to $50,848,597.26. Of this amount offshore tidelands accounted for $11,125,400.09 in bonuses and $13,040,030.23 in rentals. For the biennium period 1950–51 the State received from its State-owned lands and river-bottom oil and gas leases a total of $44,107,954.34 from rentals, bonuses, and royalties. Of this amount $6,668,518.78 was received from rentals on 473 leases comprising 1,230,715.53 acres, and $20,428,389.60 from royalties on production from 234 leases. During this biennium Louisiana sold 294 leases of State-owned lands and water bottoms. These 294 leases cover approximately 463,608 acres, and cash bonuses paid for them totaled $17,011,075.97, an average of $36.69 per acre.

On the assumption that all or a majority of the California State oil and gas leases are in the disputed tideland area it might be worthy of note that the royalty and rental income impounded since June 23, 1947, the date of the Supreme Court decision in the case of *Unitcd States of America* v. *California*, to September 30, 1952, inclusive amounted to $47,247,379.39.

There is also included herewith a summary of the disposition of income derived from oil and gas leases, both State and Federal, table 5.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated value of United States offshore oil resources*

PROVEN RESERVES

	Quantity (barrels)	Value ($2.50 per barrel)
Inside 3-mile limit:		
California	156,345,000	390,862,500
Texas	15,000,000	37,500,000
Louisiana	107,000,000	267,500,000
Total	278,345,000	695,862,500
Continental Shelf, outside 3-mile limit:		
California	0	0
Texas	0	0
Louisiana	214,000,000	535,000,000
Total	214,000,000	535,000,000

POTENTIAL RESERVES

Inside 3-mile limit:		
California	[1] 1,100,000,000	2,750,000,000
Texas	[2] 400,000,000	1,000,000,000
Texas	[1] [1,200,000,000]	[3,000,000,000]
Louisiana	250,000,000	625,000,000
	[3] 1,750,000,000	4,375,000,000
Continental Shelf (total):		
California	2,150,000,000	5,390,862,500
Texas	9,000,000,000	22,500,000,000
Louisiana	4,000,000,000	10,000,000,000
	15,156,000,000	37,890,000,000

NOTE.—Reserves from United States Geological Survey estimates. Value calculated at approximate current crude-oil prices.

[1] Inside 3-league limit.
[2] Inside 3-mile limit.
[3] Totals exclude data in brackets.

TABLE 2.—*Oil and gas leases, acreage oil production, royalty barrels and royalty value, public and acquired land*

State	Leases under supervision				Production calendar year 1951			
	Producing, June 30, 1952		Total, Oct. 31, 1952		Production barrels	Percent royalty	Royalty barrels	Royalty value all products [1]
	Number	Acres	Number	Acres				
Public lands:								
California	232	68,065.73	5,867	2,273,325.42	24,988,114	10.86	2,712,890	$7,319,042.88
Colorado	137	79,351.59	4,882	4,632,193.20	12,917,824	14.27	1,845,515	4,760,013.92
Louisiana	17	2,467.24	137	21,057.47	87,643	12.50	10,955	37,195.68
Montana	367	131,706.98	5,710	5,498,161.87	1,868,459	14.10	263,493	617,397.90
New Mexico	715	490,179.11	10,033	9,105,126.74	12,534,843	10.60	1,328,974	3,892,148.59
Oklahoma	31	3,214.53	567	95,770.83	165,264	11.25	18,591	58,488.33
Texas								
Utah	25	28,907.44	7,064	8,034,740.23	552,556	15.38	84,965	210,997.38
Wyoming	786	378,487.21	24,104	16,892,269.96	39,253,203	12.65	4,965,694	10,548,518.14
Total	2,310	1,182,379.83	58,364	46,552,645.72	[2] 92,367,906	12.16	[3] 11,229,077	27,443,802.82
Total United States	2,392	1,227,417.12	68,769	53,175,177.28	[2] 92,361,890	12.16	[3] 11,227,580	27,544,265.74
Acquired lands:								
California								$415,221.54
Colorado			70	63,576.93				
Louisiana	5	11,802.50	40	54,407.95	2,826,194	11.96	338,064	892,721.53
Montana			171	152,274.63				
New Mexico			23	36,477.86				
Oklahoma	4	678.00	38	14,783.69	199,054	6.67	13,275	35,728.37
Texas	5	1,537.58	69	30,862.37	170,695	9.38	16,009	47,128.36
Utah			12	13,770.96				
Wyoming	6	2,400.00	67	39,378.20	51,844	12.06	6,254	15,437.35
Total	20	16,418.08	490	405,532.59	3,247,789	11.50	373,602	1,406,237.15
Total United States	48	33,304.77	1,540	1,408,029.41	3,342,060	11.53	385,385	1,446,091.53
Grand total	2,330	1,198,797.91	58,854	46,958,178.31	95,615,693	12.13	11,602,679	28,850,039.97
Grand total United States	2,440	1,260,781.89	70,309	54,583,206.69	95,703,950	12.13	11,612,965	28,990,357.27

[1] Royalty value includes oil, gas, gasoline and LPG.

[2] United States total less due to adjustment (Illinois).

TABLE 3.—*Competitive leasing and bonus results, public domain and restricted Indian lands, fiscal year ended June 30, 1952*

State	Acres sold	Bonus per acre	Total bonus
New Mexico (Federal land)	3,193	$43.70	$139,499
New Mexico, Colorado and Utah (Indian land)	250,334	20.20	5,055,964
California (Federal land)	250	54.75	13,697
Louisiana (Federal land)	284	74.00	21,249
Mississippi (Federal land)	6¼	489.00	3,051
Kansas (Federal land)	3,261	76.20	248,222
Oklahoma (Federal land)	27½	45.00	1,238
Oklahoma (Indian except Osage)	84,686	11.22	950,154
Colorado (Federal land)	1,710	22.10	37,716
Montana (Federal land)	1,860	23.00	42,883
Montana (Indian land)	46,019	10.35	477,892
Wyoming (Federal land)	1,984	33.70	66,785
Wyoming (Indian land)	8,848	13.55	135,899
North Dakota (Indian land)	19,691	31.15	613,296
South Dakota (Indian land)	23,554	3.72	89,003
Utah (Indian land)	12,996	$45.80	$595,695
Total Federal	12,576	45.70	574,340
Total Indian	446,128	17.74	7,917,603
Total Federal and Indian (except Osage)	458,704	18.50	8,491,943
State lease sales of State-owned land:			
New Mexico (year ending June 30, 1952)	173,739	36.78	6,390,769
Oklahoma (July 1949–December 1950)	81,593	9.34	762,502
State lease sales of offshore land:			
Louisiana (sold in 1948)	600,653	15.73	9,451,942
Louisiana (sold in 1950–51)	463,608	36.69	17,011,076
Mississippi (1948–50)	1,965	1.17	2,314
Texas (Nov. 7, 1947)	374,937	19.28	7,230,445

TABLE 4.—*Summary of minerals-leasing procedure of State-owned and Federal public land*

State	Method of leasing	Oil royalty	Rental	Remarks
California	Sealed bids	Rate fixed in offer to lease.	$1 to $5 per acre per year or as specified in offer.	Special "bid formula" based on rates of production used to determine royalty rate. Present minimum 16⅔ percent.
Louisiana	Sealed bids and public auction.	Minimum 12½ percent.	$1 to $10 per acre or half bonus bid for delayed rental.	Bids on basis of cash rental, royalty bonus, or payments out of production.
Texas	Public auction	do	Minimum 10 cents per acre, graduating to $1 per acre.	Royalty and rental rates, minimum bonus, and obligation for drilling fixed in advertisement.
Public domain [1] (i. e., Federal land).	Sealed bids	do	Minimum $1	Step scale presently used 12½ to 25 percent.

[1] Land within a producing structure.

Source: U. S. Geological Survey.

TABLE 5.—*Disposition of income derived from oil and gas leases*

Federal: All moneys deposited in the Treasury of the United States for distribution as follows:

(a) Thirty-seven and one-half percent to the States (and Alaska) where lands are located, for roads and public schools.

(b) Fifty-two and one-half percent to the Reclamation Fund.

(c) Ten percent to "Miscellaneous receipts." (Sec. 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended, 30 U. S. C. and Supp. 191.)

California: All moneys (except income from State school lands) deposited to the credit of State Lands Act funds, and distributed as follows:

(a) For payment of refunds.

(b) Expenses of State lands commissions.

(c) Balance transferred as follows:

1. Thirty percent to general fund.

2. Twenty-three and one-half percent to State beach fund.

3. Forty-six and two-thirds percent to State park fund. (Sec. 6816, Deering's California Codes.)

Louisiana: All moneys deposited in the State treasury to the credit of the general fund, provided that 10 percent of minimum royalties shall be deposited in the road fund to the credit of the parish in which production occurred. Excess above the minimum royalty of one-eighth specified in Revised Statutes 30; 127 is dedicated under Revised Statutes 30; 133 as follows:

(a) To Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College and to payment of old-age assistance, other social security benefits, and the State hospital board as apportioned by the Governor, not exceeding $2 million per year.

(b) Any sum over $2 million to be used in servicing and retiring the State debt. (Revised Statutes of Louisiana, 1950, as amended, title 30, secs. 133, 136.)

Texas: Proceeds from lands belonging to the public free school funds and the permanent fund of the several asylums are to be credited to the permanent funds of those institutions. Proceeds from lands belonging to the permanent fund of the University of Texas are to be credited to the available fund of the university except that amount required by the constitution to be credited to the permanent university fund. All amounts received from unsurveyed school lands and two-thirds of amounts received from other areas are to be credited to the permanent school fund and one-third from said other areas is to be credited to the general revenue fund. It would appear that the term "other areas" includes the Gulf offshore lands. (Arts. 5347 and 5364, Vernon's Civil Statutes of Texas.)

Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1953

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of an address delivered by George Lederman, manager of the Cattle Shochtim

would not now, in all probability, pose its present potential threat. Yet, in 1951—the last year for which we have complete figures—only 7 percent of USDA research activities was in the field of fundamental research, while 93 percent was composed of applied projects.

We believe Congress should make its appropriations for research in terms of broader areas leaving to the research administrators details of distribution and allocation. The administrators should base their judgment on overall accomplishments rather than upon the results of individual small projects, many of which inevitably prove unproductive.

Lack of progress in fundamental fields of research is retarding progress in applied fields. Fundamental research frequently opens up new opportunities to develop applied programs of great practical value.

Failure to launch and carry through aggressive research programs in such fields as cotton genetics, breeding, plant pathology, microbiological deterioration, and in other associated fields may well prevent achievement of a real breakthrough in the technology of cotton production. Current knowledge in these fields has been pretty well exploited already.

It is high time that fundamental research should not have to be bootlegged at the expense of appropriations made for applied research.

What to do about it?

We cannot urge too strongly that cotton producers, individually and through their associations, call to the attention of members of House and Senate Agriculture Committees, and of the House Appropriations Committee, the need for their sympathetic support of a broad agricultural research program of a fundamental nature.

We have good reason to believe that Secretary of Agriculture Benson is research-minded and that he will give full and vigorous cooperation to broadening the scope of agricultural research and placing emphasis on fundamental projects such as that needed to tackle the problem of cavitoma.

It is not at all imaginative to declare that the future of American agriculture depends upon the intelligence and resourcefulness with which we use our research potential today.

United States Soldiers in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1953

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS IN GERMANY

To the Christian Science Monitor:

I read in your January 8 issue a letter from a woman who recently had been in Germany. I have tried to give the letter more than snap-judgment appraisal. The portion which particularly disturbs me is her disparaging reference to young American soldiers stationed here.

My husband is an American officer who has been here for nearly 2 years in a combat outfit. I have been here for 1 year. We have discussed the letter together and can say only this:

The writer has been badly informed, possibly by Germans themselves, when she calls teen-aged American soldiers unruly and insulting to Germans. The average American soldier on the streets and autobahnen of Germany today is noticeable only because he wears the uniform of a fine and wonderful country. He is not unruly or insulting. I shop constantly on the German economy, and meet constantly American soldiers doing the same thing. I have yet to see or hear discourtesy.

Indeed, isn't there something to be said in gratitude by the Germans for the enormous amount spent by American soldiers? You should see the boxes going through the Army post offices containing German clocks, china, figurines, toys, and other luxury goods.

The American soldier here at Christmastime in Germany is magnificently generous. I have seen him shopping for food for German needy families. My husband's battalion entertained an orphanage at dinner and then completely outfitted them in clothing as well as toys. These men gave gladly and were well repaid in the joy of the children. It took the battalion a little while to locate an orphanage which was not already adopted by other United States groups.

If, and I doubt this very much, your letter writer had visited several German Gasthaus drinking places she might have seen evidence of loudness. A man who drinks too much in any country, a man of any nationality, is apt to lose his usual better sense. My husband tells me that most of the difficulties brought to the attention of the battalion, involving Germans, concern the drinking places.

Another point which should be brought out is the flagrant behavior of some German women. Anyone standing outside an American Kaserne can see the women waiting for pick-ups. These women walk the streets in search of American soldiers.

There are, it can't be denied, some serious incidents between Germans and Americans, but these incidents are unusual enough to be printed in our Stars and Stripes and read by us just as our fellow Americans read of crime back home. The Army justice meted out is swift and severe. Take a look at the German laws for like crimes and you'll see how much worse it is for an American to kill a German than for a German to kill an American.

These American men are not here because they think it a lark. They are hard working, levelheaded and sometimes homesick. I am proud to be associated with them.

BEVERLEY S. NEWBERN.

GERMANY.

The Tidelands Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1953

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of the United States has declared six times, in effect, that the States never did own nor have any title to the submerged lands in the so-called tidelands controversy. It is high time that, once and for all, this issue be put at rest. Misleading talk of restoring and giving back to the States their submerged lands should stop. There is no giving back to a person or to a State something he or it never had.

It is wrong for Congress to try to reverse the Supreme Court in a matter peculiarly within judicial determination, namely, land titles. As a matter of fact, for the Congress to recognize and confirm a title that the Supreme Court has six times stated never existed is a most grave encroachment by the legislative body upon the judicial branch.

Passage of this legislation will serve to weaken public confidence in Congress at a time when Congress is striving to assert its constitutional position in our national affairs. Every action, every deed of the Congress should be consistent with the high level of confidence which it seeks to attain.

In my opinion, the legislation as passed by the Congress last year and vetoed by the then President Truman was unconstitutional. Present legislation before the Congress is likewise unconstitutional because the Supreme Court has decided that the rights of the Federal Government to these offshore lands are paramount. Such lands could be the subject of treaties with foreign governments. Only the Federal Government has the power to enter into treaties. Only the Federal Government has the power and the right to protect these assets against foreign invaders. Neither the States of Texas, California, nor Louisiana, has the Navy to protect these assets.

The question has been raised whether Congress could legally divest itself of its responsibility for the conduct of external affairs such as those involved in the recognition of a 3-mile sea boundary. An attempt to delegate or to abdicate responsibility in this field might well be an illegal delegation or abdication of powers, just as any attempt on the part of Congress to delegate control of interstate commerce, or the power to declare war, to any of the States or any particular group of States would be illegal.

I am also in accord with the opinion that any of the other 45 States in the Union would have the right to challenge, in the Federal courts, any law such as the legislation now pending before us. Such delegation of powers cannot be delegated to a few coastal States to the exclusion of a majority of the States.

On Monday of this week, Attorney General Brownell testified before a Senate committee and made clear that he did not intend to cast doubt upon the constitutionality of the legislation before the Congress but in doing so, he did, in fact, cast serious doubt on the constitutionality. To avoid the constitutionality test, Attorney General Brownell went on to recommend legislation which would not quitclaim title but would merely grant the authority which the States would need to appropriate the oil in question for their own use and benefit. So now, if the Brownell position is to be given any credence, the only issue left is oil, and since the Supreme Court says this oil belongs to you, what right has Congress to give away your oil to three States?

In his testimony, Attorney General Brownell has succeeded in removing the cloak of States' righteousness from the worst piece of legislation ever before the United States Congress. If legislation should come before the Congress in the form of the Brownell recommendation, it will be viewed in the ugly form which it really is. I am of the further opinion that the legislation recommended by Attorney General Brownell would not stand up in court. The Supreme Court would see through the subterfuge.

Two years ago I stated on the floor of this House that I respected those who voted for the tidelands legislation on the basis of States' rights principles. At that time, I said that these principles would never be before us were it not for the booty involved.

With the acceptance of the Supreme Court decision—and it should be so accepted—these rights and principles have been constitutionally, and legally, and for all purposes, properly resolved. Then only the oil is left. The question now remains whether the legislators of the other 45 States want to give away oil which belongs as much to their constituents as it does to the constituents of Texas, Louisiana, and California. I do not.

Administration Sees the Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERA BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1953

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a most timely article by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes entitled "Administration Sees the Light," from the Washington Evening Star of March 4, 1953:

ADMINISTRATION SEES THE LIGHT—GROWING ALARM, INDICATED OVER AIM OF PRIVATE INTERESTS TO GRAB ALL PUBLIC LAND AND ITS NATURAL RESOURCES

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The Eisenhower administration is indicating growing alarm that what some private interests are seeking, with considerable support in Congress, is not at all the conservation of natural resources envisioned by Theodore Roosevelt, whom the President has made a model for his conservation policy.

The administration belatedly seems to be waking up to the very clear fact, emphasized in this column before it assumed office, that the drive to quitclaim offshore oil lands to the States is the opening of a Pandora's box for a really big grab of our natural resources. In short, to establish a precedent for turning back all public lands within the States. That would mean easier exploitation of minerals and metals, forest resources, grazing lands, and development of rivers for private profit rather than in the general public interest. That is directly contrary to the Theodore Roosevelt policy of preserving our natural resources by integrated national management in behalf of all the people, which is not possible if every State where there are public lands is left to its own whims in bargaining off natural resources in what now is the public domain.

Qualms of the administration were revealed by Attorney General Herbert Brownell when he appeared before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. To its surprise, he recommended that Congress grant to the coastal States only the authority to administer and develop oil and other natural resources in the marginal seas within their historic boundaries and not grant a blanket quitclaim title to the land which is what President Eisenhower so blithely promised during the campaign.

This would still give the coastal States the revenues from these lands, and thus would deprive all other States of the benefits from them, such as Federal control would provide, but ostensibly would leave title to the offshore lands still in the Federal Government, where the Supreme Court said it belonged. That would avoid a challenge of constitutionality from the Supreme Court if the issue were raised there again, as it could very well be if Congress granted title to the States. The Court said the States had no title to these lands nor any property interest therein.

Though citing the constitutional question as the reason why he opposed a blanket quitclaim for the States, it was manifest that Attorney General Brownell also was aware of the inherent dangers to our whole natural resource conservation policy should the granting of title in the coastal lands be taken as a precedent for taking title by the States of all other public lands.

For, when he was asked by Senator BARRETT, Republican, of Wyoming, why the public lands within the so-called public lands States, of which Wyoming is 1 of 14, should not also be given to the States, Mr. Brownell said that was an entirely separate question and had no relation to the issue involved in the offshore lands. However, a connection has been argued by Senator BARRETT and other public-land-States members of the committee at every opportunity since the hearings began.

Furthermore, Senator BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska, committee chairman, announced at the outset of these hearings that "when the tidelands question is settled there are plans for the introduction of a bill that will make the same theory applicable to public lands now held by the Federal Government within the States." Also Senator HUNT, Democrat, of Wyoming, has introduced a bill to convey mineral resources in the public lands to the States, while Senator WELKER, Republican, of Idaho, has proposed the sale to private interests of TVA in the South. These are but samples of public expressions on the subject.

The tide is rolling up fast, until it seems to have made a dent within high administration quarters. Simultaneously, public opinion seems likewise to be rising against this proposed reversal of our established conservation policy, and the Attorney General clearly reflected that. He also may have been influenced by the testimony before the committee last week by Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, who now has such a big public following as a result of his campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination.

The Tennessee Senator, who urged that a commission be appointed to study the whole problem involved in the offshore lands before Congress takes any action, warned that "we are leading to some new policy—or perhaps I should say no policy—with regard to the public lands and their natural resources—with regard to public power development, the national parks, and reclamation lands within the interior of the United States.

"If we are saying under the quitclaim bill, as I think we are, that the individual States are entitled to this land beneath the sea that has been considered in the same light as public lands, then it is difficult to see any difference whatsoever in saying that the individual States within the United States are entitled to the public lands within their own boundaries."

As for the President, he added, "I know that the American people did not elect him to preside over the liquidation of our national wealth."

State control of the offshore lands is not only wrong in itself, but could perpetrate untold wrongs as a precedent.

Amendment of Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1953

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include the opening testimony of Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, before the Education and Labor Committee this week on the question of amending the Taft-Hartley Act. It will be followed later by his specific recommendations for amendments to the act.

The statement follows:

The American Federation of Labor seeks the enactment by the present Congress of substantial and far-reaching modifications in the Taft-Hartley law. In setting forth our recommendations before this committee, I submit the best judgment of the organization I represent—an organization with more than 8 million members. These recommendations are not preconceived notions, nor special pleading. They are the result of extensive and searching examination of the record. They are the product of studied consultation with representatives of the organizations making up the American Federation of Labor regarding the operation of the national labor law as it is now written and administered. I offer these proposals in the spirit of constructive contribution to the legislative process, in the hope that they will be given dispassionate study and will lead to favorable action.

Promotion of industrial peace is the purpose which the American Federation of Labor has not only proclaimed, but also put to practice. The record of our organization and its affiliates in recent years shows that we have pursued this purpose with a notable measure of success. To insure the settlement of industrial disputes by peaceful means and, above all, through the voluntary efforts of labor and management, rather than through compulsion of the State, should be the aim of Government in a free society.

Let me make two important points clear. President Eisenhower said in his state of the Union message to the Congress that we need "a law that merits the respect and support of labor and management." The Taft-Hartley Act, now on the books, does not merit nor enjoy the respect of American trade unions—and that's putting it mildly. We feel quite strongly that this law is unjustifiably oppressive and that it has placed intolerable restrictions upon the exercise of basic rights and freedoms by trade unions and their members just because they are part of organized labor.

As a result, this law that purports to promote labor-management peace, has served in many instances to instigate and prolong strife.

Even in normal times, this would be deplorable. In the present world crisis it is dangerous to the national safety. The struggle in which the free world is engaged with Communist aggression may take years to resolve. To meet our international responsibilities and to safeguard our national security, we need unity in America. We need, above all, greater unity and greater cooperation between American business and American labor. This Congress can make a great contribution toward that objective by enacting a labor-management law that will be acceptable to both sides. For the welfare of America as a whole, I ask you to give us a law under which employers and unions can

make a continuing survey of Alaskan water resources for hydroelectric power and other purposes, other than navigation, and that this agency be held responsible for the planning, construction, and operation of hydroelectric dams and transmission facilities, for the marketing of power and for the making of periodic load studies.

"(C) That the Secretary of the Interior be directed to proceed with the preparation of final project reports on hydroelectric power projects as necessary to serve the load centers and that these projects be authorized upon a finding of engineering and economic feasibility.

"(D) That the Eklutna Project Act be amended so as to increase the authorized cost of this project to allow for changes in price levels since 1948 and for modifications in the project plan of development; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be requested to prepare as soon as possible a draft of legislation covering the aforementioned objectives and make preliminary copies thereof available to leaders in Alaska for their study prior to the convening of the next Congress."

Oil From Submerged Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 9, 1953

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when the hearings on the question of the disposition of oil in the submerged lands were under way, the attorney general of the State of Tennessee testified with reference to the position of his State. There appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on March 6, 1953, an editorial indicating that he was not speaking for the State of Tennessee. Probably that circumstance could be repeated over and over in the various States of this Union. However, it is certainly appropriate to take these situations one at a time, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the Nashville Tennessean with reference to the stand of that State on the question of oil from the submerged lands.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIMELY AND DESERVED REPUDIATION

In flat repudiation of those who would misrepresent Tennessee's stand on the Republican tidelands oil grab, the State house of representatives, by an overwhelming vote, has denounced that conspiracy and called for its defeat.

In no better or more accurate way could the voice of the people be raised for preservation of the wealth of oil beneath marginal seas which belongs to all of the States, instead of a select few.

By their vote, house members administered a fitting rebuke to Gov. Frank Clement and his political friend, Attorney General Roy Beeler, who have thrown their support to the offshore raid, giving what aid and comfort they could to the covetous interests.

Now, lest there be any misunderstanding, the Nation is told that the State's attorney general cannot successfully pretend to interpret the policy on an issue of such importance. Nor does the State's chief executive, indorsing a dangerous Republican program, think in unison with his fellow citizens.

Tennessee, according to the resolution introduced by Representative Robert H. Roberts, adheres to the decisions of the Supreme Court that oil off the coastal States belongs to all the people. It recognizes also that the protection of our great national resources is also sound and traditional democratic doctrine.

Instead of giving away these billions of dollars in oil, the house indorses the plan for distribution of offshore oil income to all of the owner States for educational purposes. It declares the pending legislation as detrimental to the school children of Tennesese, and demands its defeat.

"You can't tell me," said Representative Harry Lee Senter, "that the attorney general speaks for the people of Tennessee." That official, by the way, was never elected by democratic processes as were the representatives who came direct from the cities, the hills, and the hollows, and who are indeed close to their constituents.

The members do not feel obligated to bail the Republican Party out because of a reckless campaign pledge, and they have done well to let it be known that the Governor who was elected by Democratic votes has taken grave liberties when he volunteers in behalf of that unsavory cause.

On this occasion, as always, Tennessee does not lack for a strong and forthright leadership, and the legislators who insisted that the State's position be made clear, are entitled to heartfelt public commendation.

There is also strong opposition in Washington to the so-called tidelands seizure, and Representative ROBERTS paid a deserved tribute to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER for carrying on the fight with courage and effectiveness.

There need no longer be any misapprehension regarding Tennessee's position on the tidelands deal.

So, that all may know, our house of representatives has put the record straight that this Southern State is not in favor of selling out its own and the Federal Government's interest in the oil deposits which are now in such danger of dissipation. And at the same time it has put in their proper places those who have sought to purvey the contrary Republican viewpoint. It could not have rendered a finer service.

Do Our Schools Fear Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 9, 1953

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Minneapolis Star entitled "Do Our Schools Fear Freedom?" This article represents a reprint from the Inland News, published by the Inland Steel Co. It is particularly timely at this moment because of the deep concern of thousands of Americans over our educational system and the attacks which are being made upon it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO OUR SCHOOLS FEAR FREEDOM?

Is fear of communism being used today as an excuse to limit the right of our children to be educated as we should expect? Or do our teachers and schools lack the courage to present and teach all sides of vital questions for fear of subversion accusations? Judging by what some students think about liberty and justice there is evidence that this is so.

We Americans have never been a particularly shy people. We haven't been a bit slow about telling ourselves and others how democratic we are.

Today our words about the rights of man are starting to sound a little hollow. It might be well for us to take a more critical look at ourselves.

Do we really believe in human freedom and dignity as much as we say we do? If you think so you might be surprised at some of the findings disclosed by the Purdue University opinion panel. This organization recently conducted a poll to discover what the high-school-age group thinks of freedom.

Fifty-eight percent of those polled agreed that police may be justified in giving a man the "third degree" to make him talk. Thirty-three percent said that persons who refuse to testify against themselves either should be made to talk or be severely punished—while another 20 percent were uncertain.

Twenty-five percent of the teen-agers would prohibit the right of people to assemble peaceably, saying that some groups should not be allowed to hold public meetings.

Twenty-six percent believed the police should be allowed in some cases to search a person or his home without a warrant.

Fifteen percent would deny a criminal the right to have a lawyer and only 45 percent believed newspapers should be allowed to print anything they want except military secrets.

All the rights outlined above are guaranteed Americans by their Bill of Rights. While few teen-agers would favor abolition of the bill, their answers indicate they aren't so willing to put it into practice.

The foregoing comprises a small part of the results discovered by the Purdue panel. These results are by no means conclusive for the entire United States, but they indicate that if many of our rights were put on a ballot, an alarming number of teen-agers would vote to throw them away.

What's the explanation for this trend in totalitarian thinking among American high-school students?

Educational institutions must shoulder part of the blame. In a deeper sense, so should parents and other private citizens. We have permitted political opportunists and hysterical anti-Communists to single out our schools and colleges and question their right to teach freely and without direction from the State. In one small town all books on communism were removed from the local library.

One of our great Midwestern universities was threatened with investigation because its curriculum included among many others, courses in Marxian economics.

Another university insisted that its faculty members take loyalty oaths or suffer loss of tenure. When the university lost some of its best men because they resented this implied lack of faith in their patriotism, the loyalty oath requirement was abolished by the courts, but not before it had done its damage.

The inevitable outcome of these invasions of educational freedom has been to make many teachers afraid of teaching conflicting theories of government and freedom to their students. An example of the fear of "freedom subjects" that now pervades schools was shown by the Purdue panel.

After looking at the questions the university panel wanted to put to their students, several school administrators frankly implied that they were afraid to ask questions

plant and tools. One authority estimates that, in 1947 and 1948, American nonfinancial corporations fell more than $10 billion short of setting aside enough money to rebuild their plant and machinery as they wore out. In other words, there is a strong possibility that the profits of American industry are being overstated by a wide margin and thus overtaxed by an equally wide margin.

A tax law which contributes to the "wearing out" of American industry is no boon to the workingman, whose future improved condition depends upon continued betterment of America's industrial machine.

Much has been made of the "quick writeoff" provision of the tax laws, which permits corporations to deduct from their profits a part or all of the cost of the new plant in the unusually short time of 5 years. This provision has been held up as an "aid" to industry. As a matter of fact, in World War II and after Korea, it became a necessity to overcome the defects of the present method of computing depreciation and the basic mistakes of the so-called excess-profits tax. The quick writeoff encouraged rapid expansion of the Nation's industrial productive capacity to meet an emergency, indicating that a more modern schedule of rates for computing depreciation for tax purposes should go hand in hand with a dynamic, expanding American industry with ever-increasing job opportunities.

BIG FRAUDS GO WITH BIG TAXES

Today the American taxpayer, big or little, is working his way through a revolving door. His daily exertions merely bring him back to where he started. The state has long since passed the point where the rich man and the big corporations can finance its largesse. Even the uneducated shophand now knows that public spending must be financed by the masses whom it is supposed to benefit. Taxes have reached the point of diminishing returns. The taxes on alcoholic beverages, for example, are so high that the net returns to the Government have been actually less than they were before the increased rates were put into effect. On top of that, bootlegging has returned on an immense scale because the exorbitant tax rate makes it profitable. High taxes, fraud, and loose morals have always gone together since the days of Solomon. Recent disclosures of widespread fraud in connivance with tax-collecting officials are but a modern version of the latter days of Rome.

A thorough cleanup of our Federal tax laws is a must if the American economy is to be preserved. In the 40 years since the adoption of the income tax, our tax laws have sprouted from a few pieces of simple legislation to a maze of special provisions so complex that not even members of the tax-writing committees of Congress can fully understand all their effects. Federal tax laws alone comprise more than 400,000 words.

Nor are the tax laws any more fair than they are clear. Says the American Taxpayers Association: "There's something grossly unfair about a Federal tax which prohibits a working wife from deducting 1 cent for the person she must hire to care for her home and children while she is away earning a paycheck."

American taxpayers might wonder, too, if there is anything fair about a government which taxes capital gains of Americans while sending $50 billion of their tax-paid money overseas for foreign aid when foreigners of any other major world power do not have to pay a capital-gains tax.

To many students of economics the most important announcement made since the new administration took over in Washington came from Chairman DANIEL A. REED, of the House Ways and Means Committee. His tax-writing committee intends to spend most of this year on a complete rewrite of Federal tax laws. As an initial step he and his associates in Congress do not intend to extend the excess-profits tax law when it expires June 30. The plans of this committee hold real promise. But the key to lower taxes, lower prices, and more income for the American people is, of course, reduced public expenditures.

LOWER TAXES DEPEND UPON LESS SPENDING

In the last fiscal year Federal expenditures were more than the aggregate income, after taxes, of all persons receiving $5,000 and over. Total estimated Government expenditures—Federal, State, and local—for the current fiscal year will be equivalent to the total wages and salaries of 75 percent of the number employed in nongovernment pursuits in this country. If Uncle Sam continues his spending spree, he will end as did Necker, the French minister of finance, after the fall of the Bastille—"trying to organize prosperity by generalizing poverty."

Spending, for a time, seems popular to politicians. Eventually, as it did in the days of Solomon, spending catches up—even with the politicians. It has begun to catch up with them in America. As long as the spenders could say, "You never had it so good"—and make people believe it—their spending could continue. But now, as people are beginning to realize they've never been had so good, they are demanding an end to political spending, a return to a balanced budget and a level of taxes that will not consume their substance.

Spending has wrecked every nation which carried it too far. Its danger to America is epitomized by the experience of Austria. Said Fritz Machlup, the economist, in describing the process: "Austria was successful in pushing through policies which are popular all over the world. She increased public expenditures, she increased wages, she increased social benefits, she increased bank credits, she increased consumption. After all these achievements she was on the verge of ruin."

Hope for Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1953

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hope for Lithuania," from the Evening Herald, Shenandoah, Pa., issue of February 14, 1953:

HOPE FOR LITHUANIA

A ray of hope attends today's observance of the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

To Americans of Lithuanian extraction, a great many of whom reside in and about the Shenandoah area, and to all others who have deplored the brutal confiscation of an erstwhile gallant Republic by the communistic Soviet Union, this anniversary has occasioned sorrow and sympathy since 1940. That was the fatal year in which the Lithuanian people were enslaved and their freedom forfeited by sheer force.

The tragic plight of these people failed to arouse in a practical sense the powerful nations, including our own United States, who formulated the Atlantic Charter. The record is clear, pitifully so, of this abandonment by the signatories of that very same Atlantic Charter. The four freedoms represented grim irony to Lithuanians, and their Baltic neighbors, Estonians and Latvians, for they, in the truest sense of the word, were a forgotten people.

But the advent of 1953 offers signs of encouragement and this is why today's observance of Republic of Lithuania day holds a more cheerful aspect. The hopes of Lithuanians are anchored on the pledge of President Eisenhower's announced intentions to request the United States Congress to repudiate the Yalta Pact and similar vicious deals, which amounted to a sellout of these little countries to Soviet tyranny.

America's announced intentions to actively champion the cause of sovereign rights and restored self-government for Lithuania and all other victims of Soviet aggression and injustice will greatly hearten these millions of victims.

We feel the utmost confidence that the President will call upon Congress to serve notice on the Soviet Union to halt genocide in Lithuania and the rest of the occupied countries. We hope this forthcoming action will also include demands to return deportees from the slave-labor camps in Siberia to their native lands and that Soviet troops and secret police be removed forthwith.

The Soviet must be informed in plain words that nothing less will suffice than the total restoration of independence to Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and the others, not forgetting Poland, where a puppet government directed by the Kremlin is ruling with an iron hand.

Since 1940, the people of Lithuania have suffered sorely. They have seen their precious liberties taken away; their private enterprises have been ruthlessly confiscated. Human rights have been denied these people; they have been forcibly converted to mere chattels of the communistic Soviet Union.

For centuries Lithuania has been a progressive, cultured, and industrious land. From 1795, when Czarist Russia occupied Lithuania, until 1918, when Lithuania declared its independence, the flame of liberty burned low but in the hearts of the people hope beat steadily. Then, until 1940, the Lithuanian Republic made tremendous strides and won international recognition. But the rape of this country 13 years ago was a black stain in the world's history of freedom. This crime has offended and angered all true lovers of liberty.

On this day, then, we fervently wish for a new era to dawn for gallant Lithuania and that the day of liberation comes to pass in the foreseeable future.

Who Gets Offshore Oil?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRAZIER REAMS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1953

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Toledo Blade of March 5, 1953, entitled "Who Gets Offshore Oil?"

The appearance of Attorney General Herbert Brownell before the Senate Interior Committee earlier this week wearing shoes that didn't match suggests that the confusion which has marked the Eisenhower Administration's approach of the issue of offshore oil, from the first campaign pronouncement to the present moment, has even the methodical Mr. Brownell in a dither.

What brought the Attorney General up to Capitol Hill so incongruously shod was the need to present what was then the most recent modification of legislation to give the individual States the rich returns expected from exploitation of the oil-rich areas beneath the seas. His was not the first official

version of this legislation, nor was it to be the last.

Offshore oil is one of the problems which General Eisenhower, as a candidate, didn't handle very well. When he was first sounded out on the subject, he revealed his ignorance of the fact that the Supreme Court had ruled on the issue. Then, on October 13 at New Orleans, he declared for "recognition of these ancient property rights of the States in submerged lands" and promised, if elected, to approve bills that "recognize the traditional concept of State ownership in these submerged areas."

Since the election, a counsel of caution obviously has reached the President's ear. Notions of unlimited rights for the States in submerged lands have been discarded. Even when the first official administration proposals were made last week by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay and Secretary of the Navy Robert B. Anderson, limits were defined. These were to be the "historical boundaries" of the States concerned—3 miles off California, 3½ miles off Louisiana, 10½ miles off Texas and the Florida west coast.

When Philip B. Perlman, former solicitor general, appeared next day and raised questions about the legality of the McKay-Anderson proposal, suggesting it surely would be tested before the Supreme Court which four times has ruled that national rights are paramount in that area, there had to be further compromise. So Mr. Brownell appeared in mismatched shoes to trim the administration's position a bit more. He suggested that "instead of granting to the States a blanket quitclaim title to the submerged lands within their historic boundaries, the Federal Government would grant to the States only such authority as is required for the States to administer and develop the natural resources." "All land beyond these boundaries," he declared, "should be developed under the exclusive supervision and control of the Federal Government, with all income therefrom going to the benefit of the entire country."

Testifying a day later, Jack B. Tate, deputy legal adviser of the State Department, has forced further revision of how far this process can go. Recognition of State claims to offshore boundaries beyond the 3-mile limit would force abandonment of the international position the United States has maintained for 150 years, he pointed out. Claims of the States, in Mr. Tate's words, "cannot exceed those of the Nation."

Instead of asking "where do we go from here?" to make some concessions to States righters, the administration should admit that control of offshore lands is best left in the Federal Government, where the Supreme Court has located it. In trying to improvise to meet one valid objection after another to State ownership, the President and his advisers only strengthen the case for Federal ownership and control.

As this process has revealed, many of the considerations involved are national in scope. This is the most immediate of several reasons why these lands which lie along the Nation's shore can be more efficiently administered by one government in Washington than by several in Austin, Tex.; Baton Rouge, La.; Sacramento, Calif.; Tallahassee, Fla., and the capital cities of perhaps more than a dozen others of the States.

Butter Purchases by Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1953

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to present herewith Senate Concurrent Resolution O, from the 33d Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, urging the purchase of butter by our Armed Forces. The dairy and agricultural industries are very important to the Nation's economy, and I do not believe it should be jeopardized by the Government's purchase and use of butter substitutes. I think the boys in the service are entitled to have butter in their diets, and think something should be done about seeing that they get it. With the Government's stockpile of 90 million pounds of butter, it certainly seems tough that the boys have to eat oleomargarine. The resolution follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution O

Resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation to prevent the purchase of butter substitutes by our Armed Forces

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States recently purchased 960,000 pounds of butter substitutes for consumption in domestic military establishments; and

Whereas the United States Government, under the commodity credit support program has purchased for storage over 51 million pounds of surplus butter since November 1952; and

Whereas it would be a sound business practice for the Armed Forces of the United States to purchase and use the surplus butter now being stored: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact suitable legislation prohibiting the purchase of butter substitutes by our Armed Forces; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Senators MILTON YOUNG and WILLIAM LANGER and Representatives USHER BURDICK and OTTO KRUEGER.

C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD LENS,
Secretary of the Senate.
WALTER BUBEL,
Speaker of the House.
V. L. GILBREATH,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Betrayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1953

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following eloquent editorial from the New York Times of Friday, March 6, 1953:

BETRAYER OF THE DREAM

Not all the funeral pomp of the Red Square could keep Lenin alive, or even his memory. It will be so with Stalin. Dictators, in death, are one with lesser men. Alexander, at Babylon, of a fever; Caesar, in Rome, of stab wounds, one of them inflicted by his dear friend Brutus; Napoleon, at St. Helena, of cancer and despair; Mussolini, in a small Italian hill town, above Milan, of bullet wounds from Italian pistols; Hitler, by his own hand, in order to avoid other hands, in his Berlin bunker; so, throughout history, read the death notices. By steel or lead, by hardening of the arteries or softening of the brain, by infections and fevers, by the accidents of nature common to us all, the kings depart. Death:

Comes at the last, and with a little pin
Bores through his castle wall, and farewell king!

But Joseph Stalin did not die quite alone. A dream died with him—or rather let us say there were removed the last tawdry rags of a dream, the ultimate shabby remnant of a dream, the cynical caricature of a dream. The span runs from Karl Marx, smoking cheap cigars, living in his dismal London flat, spending tedius days at the British Museum. Karl Marx, bearded, bald, crusty, tireless, and tiresome, trying to turn sentimental socialism into a science, striving to make a logic out of brotherhood. He was mistaken in many of his observations, wrong in almost all his prophecies. His Socialist heaven would have been as unworkable as it was dreary. But somewhere behind his curiosity stubborn and ungenial mind was a hope and dream for humanity.

Joseph Stalin took this dream, already dimmed by the words and acts of Lenin, and ruthlessly betrayed what was left of it. For him it was a means of power. The Marxian vision, as he interpreted it, destroyed countless human lives, made countless others wretched, spread fear across the world. Never again, within the time of man, will the old Marxist slogans sound sweet in the ears of humane and sensitive persons. Was this Stalin's historic mission? If so, it is now fulfilled.

Development of Ski Area at Hidden Valley, Estes Park, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1953

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado, and also an article from the Denver Post of March 4, 1953:

Senate Joint Memorial 12

Memorializing the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior for the development of a ski area at Hidden Valley, Estes Park, Colo.

Whereas throughout Colorado and the Nation, participation in winter sports and especially skiing has been increasing rapidly and steadily during the past 10 years. Colorado ski areas last year enjoyed a record-breaking season with facilities taxed to the point the sport was actually being discouraged because desired facilities were not available; and

Whereas since 1941 there has been a rapid growth of ski area development, and yet in that time demand has far outstripped expansion until today facilities are vastly more overcrowded than they were in 1941. Nor has this expansion reached its peak. If the population remained static—which it obviously will not do—experts estimate that interest and participation in skiing and other winter sports have reached, probably, only one-fourth of its ultimate potential; and

Whereas clearing of snow which has been a major problem in other national park areas has not, over a period of years, been a problem in the Rocky Mountain; and

Whereas with the installation of the chair lift, winter sports enthusiasts would be

in no small measure to certain crippling amendments to the Defense Production Act last year, which allowed enough exemptions from controls to make a workable price-control program impossible. Those of us in Congress who fought for a stronger price-control measure at the time warned that just such a situation would happen if too many loopholes in the law are allowed.

The President's decontrol actions have met with approval in certain quarters, particularly those who stand to profit directly. As for the great majority of the public, the consumers, the wage earners, the people who live on small fixed incomes and others whose income is limited, they are keeping their fingers crossed and are just hoping for the best. As recently as the middle of January the Gallup poll reported that 61 percent of the voters favored the retention of price and wage controls, only 29 percent indicated controls should be discarded, and 10 percent had no opinion. Actually, this poll shows that the sentiment for retaining controls is stronger today than it was after the end of World War II when the question of retaining or discontinuing OPA regulations was being considered. The American public has since learned a lesson.

At the present time, there is considerable sentiment in Congress for the retention of at least standby price-control authority. Our involvement in Korea and the international tension which followed led Congress, after careful deliberation, to provide the authority for economic controls 2½ years ago. We are still tied down in Korea, and world tensions have not abated. With Stalin removed from the world scene, we have no assurances that the international situation will improve; for the present we are hoping it will not deteriorate further. Consequently, we should not discount the possibility that an aggressive move of Communist design, instigated by the new rulers in the Kremlin, may force a sharp rise in our military program in the future. This would immediately make economic controls imperative, no matter how distasteful they may be.

From past experience we know that it takes Congress at least 3 months before a good controls law is enacted and another 4 to 6 months before that law begins to operate effectively. It is during this interim period of 7 or 8 months that the greatest inflationary danger occurs, with consumers and businessmen alike engaged in scare-buying, hoarding, and profiteering. The 7-percent increase in prices between June 1950, when the invasion of South Korea took place, and January 1951, when price controls were finally imposed, has been estimated to have cost the American people the sum of $18 billion. That is the inflationary price it paid during those 7 months, aside from the human suffering and strain upon our economy.

Taking that lesson into consideration, it seems to me that the presence of a standby controls measure on our statute books is highly desirable, since the enactment of such a law would provide a minimum insurance against inflation. To me, it appears to be somewhat premature to lift controls, authorized by law, in wholesale fashion. At a time when the cost of living is still at an all-time high, when the tax burden is a painful reality to all of us, even the most trivial price increase is an added burden on the American consumer. By removing these controls prematurely and too quickly, the new administration is adding to that burden.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to believe that the dangers of inflation are completely over. True, prices of many products, especially farm products, have slackened somewhat. At the same time, however, many business analysts have noted that the economy of the country is in a precarious balance, with the very real possibility of either a serious inflation or a depression. There are many trouble spots all over the globe that could flare up and quickly involve our country in heavy additional military expenditures, with inflation an unavoidable result, unless the machinery to combat such inflation remains intact and available for use.

In conclusion, therefore, I urge that we retain and utilize those controls which are making a contribution to a stabilized price situation in the interests of the hard-pressed and too often all but forgotten consumer. Furthermore, we should provide legislation for additional standby price control authority that could be put into effective use as soon as the impact of more serious military actions abroad or of inflation at home should indicate the need for such action. Anything less than standby economic controls would weaken our whole economy in the event of a sudden emergency, would most seriously hurt the welfare of our people, and would provide comfort for those who wish to see the American way of life destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, the standby economic controls bill which I am introducing would provide that legislation and accomplish that purpose. I trust it will receive prompt and favorable action.

Submerged Lands "Grab"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1953

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, confusion over the ownership of lands under navigable waters becomes worse confounded with every passing month. When the New Deal administration decided in the late thirties to grab the so-called tidelands, as a step to the aggrandizement of the Federal Government, the States properly resisted the move with every legal instrument at their command. The Federal assertion of ownership came only after oil had been discovered in the submerged lands, and had been exploited and developed by private individuals acting through the States. Because of its insatiable appetite for money, the New Deal saw in the tidelands a rich new source of revenue and set about rewriting history and law to prove that their ownership resided in the Federal rather than the State governments. Meanwhile, adopting the traditional legal technique of abusing opposing counsel when one's case is weak, the New Dealers, who certainly knew a grab when they saw one, charged the States with "grabbing" their own coastal lands, their title to which had been reaffirmed by the courts for more than a hundred years. As the Saturday Evening Post commented last year, "The effort to represent the States' defense of their longtime rights as a grab is as phony as a $7 bill."

As the controversy over these lands drags on from year to year, however, some of the States have asserted their rights not only to the lands within their traditional boundaries but also to the edge of the Continental Shelf itself. And meanwhile, invoking a rapacity as questionable as that of the New Deal itself, they have begun in some instances to look with covetous eyes toward the assertion of ownership of the national forests and similar preserves, within their boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, there are lands and areas within these United States which properly belong to the States, and there are areas which properly belong to the Federal Government. There are also areas whose ownership is in dispute, and there is no reason why their ownership cannot be settled equitably and fairly, without "grabs" by either level of government. If some of the States, anticipating at long last an equitable settlement of the tidelands controversy in their favor, are now going to embark on raids on Federal lands, they will, in my judgment, alienate much of the support that they now enjoy and invite chaos in the determination of ownership of these disputed lands.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following editorial from the March 5, 1953, edition of the Buffalo Evening News:

OFFSHORE OIL: WHOSE "GRAB"?

The clamor of New Deal columnists and Congressmen over the offshore oil "grab" is becoming a veritable din. It is also very misleading. The issues here are complicated, and there is a case to be made on each side, but the yelling of "grab" and "steal" doesn't help to simplify or clarify matters. Nor will it help to avert a real "grab" or "steal" by anyone who may be contemplating such a move. Like the little boy who cried "wolf," the politician who yells "grab" on a case that doesn't warrant that kind of language is risking being ignored if a case should arise that does warrant it.

Those who talk this way have conveniently forgotten some recent history. In all the years up to 1937, no Federal agency had seriously thought of asserting Federal jurisdiction over oil or any other resource in the submerged lands along the coasts—the offshore lands between low-tide mark and the 3-mile limit.

In the early thirties, a question arose when California stopped granting prospecting permits for new leases covering its offshore oil field, and various oilmen applied to Secretary of Interior Harold Ickes to override the State and give them leases under the Federal Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. Up to 1937, all such applications were flatly denied, because the late Mr. Ickes, an all-out New Deal conservationist if there ever was one, took the position that the Federal Government had no jurisdiction.

"Title to the oil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit," he said then, "is in the

State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State."

That was the so-called tidelands situation then. Nobody in Washington had any thought of denying State jurisdiction. In 1937, however, a new pool was discovered off California. A move was initiated in the State legislature to conserve part of it as a naval reserve, but the people, in a referendum, rejected the control legislation. It was then that some of the smart lawyers in Washington began playing with the idea of asserting Federal title.

It was they, in short, who made the first "grab," and they pressed the case through the courts, to the outraged howls of every coastal State. The attorneys general of most of the inland States were immediately up in arms, too, because the same logic that might sustain the Federal "grab" there could be used to support a similar "grab" for control of submerged lands under the lakes and navigable rivers.

The Supreme Court finally ruled that Uncle Sam, in the absence of legislation to the contrary, has "paramount rights." The implication was that Congress had full authority to settle the question either way, but this is the decision the New Dealers now wave like a flag over the move in Congress to restore jurisdiction to the States. For them to cry "grab" and "steal" is to ignore completely the fact that State title was never questioned until the first "grab" was made by the New Deal Federal administration, and later backed by a New Deal Supreme Court.

If the pending legislation restores the legal situation to that existing prior to 1937, and stops with that, there will have been no "grab" anywhere. But along with the move to restore State jurisdiction, there are two real "grabs" being suggested. One is the move by Texas and Florida interests to extend State title beyond the historic limits far out into the gulf to the limits of the Continental Shelf. Another is a move by various inland western interests to transfer title of Federal lands, including forest preserves and similar areas to the States. If the new Congress or administration were to get the offshore-oil question tangled up in this sort of back-to-the-States movement, they would indeed, be participating in a giveaway of our public domain and there would be point to the cry of "grab." Whatever is done about the areas just beyond the tidelands, there is no justification for giving away lands or rights in which title has long rested, both legally and historically, in the Nation rather than any State.

Republicans Doubletalk on Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY A. FINE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1953

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, in an extension of remarks on Tuesday, March 3, 1953, I pointed out that the Republican Governor of New York and his Republican-controlled legislature should be severely criticized for taking steps to deprive the people of adequate rent protection. A bill to increase the rents of tenants in New York City and in the State is now being considered in both branches of the legislature. I took issue with the report of the Republican-controlled rent commission that there is no housing shortage, even though the records indicate that 30,000 families in New York City today are living in cellar apartments, paying exorbitant rents, and in many instances sharing community kitchens and bathroom facilities. I emphasized that thousands of families are still facing a housing shortage which requires them to pay high rents for quarters which are far from desirable.

The fact that there is a housing shortage is no longer open to dispute. The New York State Rent Commission has been flatly contradicted by another Republican-controlled committee of the State legislature, the joint legislative committee on housing and multiple dwellings. This joint legislative committee has, under date of February 3, 1953, sponsored a New York State Senate bill, Pr. No. 1275, now awaiting the Governor's signature, which would legalize cellar or basement apartment occupancy for living purposes until July 1, 1955, upon a certificate from the commissioner of the department of housing and buildings and the commission of health. The committee subjoined a report to the bill in which it noted:

> The committee is of the opinion that because of the continued housing shortage, some temporary relief should be granted to the tenants who are now occupying cellar or basement apartments or rooms.

Thus we have a Republican-controlled committee on the one hand attempting to justify rent increases on the ground that there is no housing shortage, while another Republican-controlled committee relies on a finding of a housing shortage to justify statutory approval for the cellar apartment occupancy of 30,000 families in New York City.

I charge that the Republican Party has once again demonstrated that it only gives lipservice to the needs of the people; that it doubletalked in its preelection promises to the people of the State of New York, when it promised the people that it would maintain a rigid and effective rent control for their protection and that now the cat is out of the bag. A behind-the-scene deal to make the people the helpless victims of a conspiracy to raise rents for the benefit of the real-estate interests is now evident.

Economy and Efficiency in the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1953

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, people of the United States are most price-conscious at the present time, and it is always most gratifying to learn that executive departments likewise are conscious of the struggle of our taxpayers to pay heavy taxes in order to carry on the operations of our Government and provide safety for our people. The economy-mindedness of our Defense Department was brought forcibly home to me in the recent observance of the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Barksfield Air Force Base at Shreveport, La. This great Air Force base began its operations 20 years ago this month.

I attended, along with General Hoyt Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the anniversary celebration. Although the weather was very bad, a large crowd attended this celebration. One of the striking features of the observance in my opinion was the display of various types of military aircraft actually being used by our men now. They were lined up on a long parking strip at the air force base, and I noticed as I inspected one after the other that each one bore a price tag. Thousands of our local people attended this celebration. All of them stopped to see the type and character of the aircraft before them and all of them read the figures showing the actual cost to the taxpayer of these airplanes. The taxpayers are entitled to this information as to costs.

I think the people of the United States as a whole are interested in these figures and I am, therefore, presenting them to you in the order in which they have been given me, together with the cost of each type of aircraft:

B–25	$138,657
B–26	196,347
B–29	627,243
B–36	2,634,686
B–45	1,296,245
B–47	2,500,000
B–50	1,236,203
C–45	66,124
C–47	74,122
C–124	2,818,278
F–51	52,942
F–84	158,870
F–86	185,105
KC–97	1,145,258
T–93	197,971

I have no way of checking whether or not the taxpayer is getting value dollar for dollar for this equipment. The costs are, in my mind, heavy in some respect. At the same time, I think private industry in this country is producing for the Defense Department the finest machines for flying and the finest equipment for flying that has ever been produced by human hands at any time. You cannot get the best without paying for it.

Restoring Balance to Our Federal System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1953

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Operation Decentralization" from the Buffalo Evening News of March 6, 1953.

The editorial reflects, I believe, the widespread support which has greeted the announcement by the present administration that it will soon move to restore a proper balance to our Federal system of government through the medium of a Commission on Integovernmental Relations. While the tasks of such a Commission will be immense, they are, in my judgment, of major and compelling

few days ago that he has it under study but needs a longer time to reach a decision. Congressional opposition, aroused primarily by railroad and private power interests, has always cut across party lines, but the pending legislation is sponsored by Republicans, Chairman WILEY and Representative DONDERO, of Michigan. It is interesting, too, that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, when head of the M. A. Hanna Co., testified in support of the seaway construction. Defense Department spokesmen likewise have supported the project in the past as important to our national security.

The finality of the current opportunity for United States participation arises out of the Canadian Government's decision to go ahead alone with the project if necessary. This cuts the ground from under the railroad opposition, since the seaway is going to be built in any event. A Canadian corporation has been set up to build and control the entire seaway, and the Province of Ontario has been authorized to construct the power project. The State of New York has asked permission of the Federal Power Commission to act jointly with Ontario on the power development. A possible further clue to the thinking within the Eisenhower administration was given recently by Secretary of Interior McKay in an endorsement of the New York State plans.

A convincing case for the economic and military value of the seaway has been made. The St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes form part of the boundary waters of the United States. They penetrate deeply into the industrial and agricultural heartland of the United States, providing a highway for export of products and import of essential raw materials. A share in their navigational improvement and control would be important in peacetime and could be doubly important in wartime. The Canadian Government last month informed our own that it would delay its seaway plans long enough for one more chance at congressional approval of our own participation. Congress should take advantage of this opportunity in the national interest.

Stevenson Hurt United States Prestige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1953

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing recently in the Washington Evening Star under the authorship of Mr. David Lawrence, in which he comments upon an address delivered by Adlai Stevenson, former Governor of Illinois. The reactions of Mr. Lawrence to that address follow:

STEVENSON HURT UNITED STATES PRESTIGE—FORMER GOVERNOR'S REFERENCE TO "DOLLAR DIPLOMACY" PROVES THAT HE DOESN'T KNOW ITS TRUE DEFINITION

(By David Lawrence)

Adlai Stevenson starts on a trip to Asia soon, and the Eisenhower administration is asking American diplomatic representatives to extend to him all courtesies. But it would be a mistake for any foreign peoples to assume that the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1952 speaks for the United States Government.

Mr. Stevenson, under the friendly guise of good-natured quips and humorous barbs, already has done more harm to the American cause overseas than any other critic, inside or outside the Congress, has done since the Eisenhower administration took office. Fortunately, most foreign governments understand that it is the business of opposition or factional leaders to try to make political capital as well as to misrepresent the facts of their own Government's foreign policies. This is done regularly in Britain, France, Germany, and Italy. But what is done by the opposition party in the United States is more important than what the European opposition parties say. For Soviet Russia is in a better position to capitalize on the criticisms made here than on those of Europe.

Without waiting to find out the truth of what did happen, Mr. Stevenson accused Secretary of State Dulles of issuing ultimatums to Europe—a statement officially denied by the Secretary himself before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week. The former Illinois Governor went further with a charge that the United States, in effect, has a selfish material interest in the money it is spending abroad. The Moscow Communist propaganda machine has been trying for months to get evidence of this charge, and will not fail to take cognizance of what it will regard inevitably as Mr. Stevenson's apparent confirmation.

The statement in the Stevenson speech of last week which damaged American prestige in Europe is the following:

"I hope I have misread the signs of the revival of the discredited 'dollar diplomacy.' I hope we are forging no silver chains."

This comment came in connection with American efforts to determine whether American billions should be continued to countries which, if unwilling to defend themselves, might bring about such a state of weakness as to cause American funds to be wasted or lost. This was the same principle applied in the previous administration. For Mr. Stevenson now to level the innuendo of dollar diplomacy is to imply that some new, selfish factor has been introduced by the new administration here in order to use American foreign aid to gain improper ends.

The phrase "dollar diplomacy" is explained in the Beards' Basic History of the United States as follows:

"Under Theodore Roosevelt's successor, William Howard Taft, who had beaten William Jennings Bryan in the election of 1908, imperialistic activity by the President received another name. Republicans now simply called it 'dollar diplomacy.' The rose under a new name meant that it was the duty and right of the United States Government to seek out and protect opportunities that would allow American businessmen to operate freely in foreign countries and American bankers to make profitable loans abroad."

Surely there is nothing in the Eisenhower-Dulles-Stassen policies of extending aid under the mutual-security assistance laws passed by the last Congress which could even remotely justify the charge that the United States is endeavoring to obtain advantages for its businessmen or bankers or that it is seeking some special privilege of a materialistic nature.

This, of course, is what Moscow has been saying ever since President Truman launched the Marshall plan and the Mutual Security assistance plan, but it is surprising to have a former presidential nominee now attach the name "dollar diplomacy" to the very policies which are being continued by the new administration here.

Either Mr. Stevenson, in his anxiety to make clever phrases, didn't look up his history as to what dollar diplomacy means or he really believes the Eisenhower administration has some ulterior purpose of a material nature in its policies of foreign aid.

While Mr. Stevenson professed the greatest friendliness for the new administration and promised cooperation, his address, when read abroad, will be found to contain many sarcastic accusations concerning the good faith of the American Government in its relations with European governments.

The opposition parties inside European countries which have been playing on the nationalistic and patriotic feelings of their own countrymen in criticizing American policies as those of a bully will find in former Governor Stevenson's attack on his own government the very ammunition they need to help undermine the Churchill-Eden policies in Britain, and the Mayer-Pleven policies in France and the Adenauer program in Germany. It is a speech that was lost in the giggles of an admiring audience of New Dealers in New York, but it will be an expensive speech for America when Moscow and the anti-American elements in Europe get through exploiting it.

How Can a State Get Back a Title It Never Had?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1953

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Lowell Mellett, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 3, 1953, poses some interesting questions. I doubt that they can be answered logically:

DISPUTE HAS FANTASTIC FEATURES—BARKLEY'S AMUSING QUERY CONCERNING TEXAS AND LOUISIANA NAVIES BRINGS UP OTHER LOGICAL, IF BIZARRE, CONSIDERATIONS

(By Lowell Mellett)

The former Vice President, Mr. Barkley, made an amusing, if not too serious, point concerning the offshore oil deposits in his Sunday evening television appearance. If, he asked, Louisiana, Texas, and California are given the title to and the profits from the submerged lands, who then will defend the property against attack by a possible enemy? The claims of Texas and Louisiana, he said, reach far out into the Gulf of Mexico, where we can expect to see oil derricks rising in waters vulnerable to undersea boats. The enemy could not find a more attractive target nor a means of doing our war resources greater damage. Does Louisiana or Texas have a navy capable of keeping hostile snorkels out of the Gulf or would they look to the good old United States Navy for the needed protection?

They would look to the United States Navy, of course, as they would have a right to, just as Detroit or Chicago, for example, would look to the United States Air Force for protection against an air attack. The Veep's inquiry merely serves to emphasize the dog-in-the-manger nature of the position taken by the three States. They accept all the benefits of membership in the Union while seeking to withhold a part of their share of the cost.

The case of Louisiana could offer another bizarre problem. The people of the United States in 1803 bought what was then known as Louisiana from France. Thomas Jefferson bought it from Napoleon Bonaparte. He bought it with Federal money. The price was $11,250,000, plus the assumption of $3,747,268 of debts owed France by American citizens. What Jefferson and the people of the United States got was the Territory out of which has been carved the States of Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, and Louisiana, as well as most of Oklahoma, Kansas, and Minnesota and parts of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Mississippi, and Alabama. The State of Louisiana was not formed until 1820.

Texas asserts a special claim to the waters of the Gulf because of a treaty made when she relinquished her role as a sovereign republic and became one of the States. Louisiana had no such role. It was just a relatively small part of a piece of purchased land. If that gives the State a special claim now, would not the same thing be true of all the other States named above? Shouldn't they demand a special share of the anticipated royalties? And if so, to keep the argument in the realm of the fantastic where these State claims properly belong, should not the Veep's inquiry concerning State navies be expanded to include them?

Their hopes raised by Mr. Eisenhower's snap decision, made as a candidate, to support their claims, Texas and Louisiana have been engaged in pushing the claims farther and farther from shore—more than a hundred miles in the case of Texas. Eventually they may wish to make the whole of the Gulf theirs. If he could have conceived of any such attitude on the part of some as yet unborn States, Thomas Jefferson would have been astonished. He though he knew what he was buying. It was security against all foreign powers for the great, integrated empire being built by the American people.

"There is on the globe," he wrote Robert Livingston, "one single spot, the possessor of which is our natural and habitual enemy." He had in mind Great Britain, France, and Spain as possible possessors of New Orleans. He wanted no one of them situated at the mouth of the Mississippi, the natural outlet to the sea for much of the United States. If living, he would hardly look favorably on the assertion of extraordinary rights in those quarters by any one of the States resulting from his historic real estate deal.

Oregon, the Beaver State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1953

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Oregon, bordering on the Pacific Ocean in the Far West, is one of the fastest growing States in the Union. In fact, the three Western States—California, Washington, and Oregon—have made the most significant advance in the last decade in population and development of any other portion of the Nation.

Oregon is a State of great natural beauty and has a wealth not only of natural scenery but of natural resources which are only partially developed and which, when fully developed, will make our State one of the outstanding areas of the Pacific Northwest. Oregon has more than 40 percent of the potential hydroelectric power of the Nation locked up in the great Columbia River and its tributaries. The Columbia is the second largest river in the United States and with its wealth of waterpower is the key to the development which is now taking place in the area. Only 10 percent of the hydroelectric power has been developed and there is a great dearth of electric energy in the area. The great McNary, Chief Joseph, and the Dalles Dams are now under construction and when completed will add materially to the pool of hydroelectric power.

There recently appeared in the National Buyers' Guide in its February 1953 issue a factual article on Oregon entitled "Oregon, the Beaver State" which I include as part of these remarks:

OREGON, THE BEAVER STATE

Sweeping southward from the 10,000-foot heights of the Wallowa Mountains, across high rangeland plateaus and the lofty Siskiyous to the sea; and from the top of majestic Mount Hood to the 400-mile Pacific Ocean coastline, the great State of Oregon abounds with the opportunities which could only exist in one of the Nation's last frontiers.

Less than 100 years old as a State of the Union, young and vigorous Oregon offers limitless horizons for those who would enter into business, industry, or agriculture. Its magnificent scenery, recreational facilities, and diversified climatic conditions provide happy and bountiful living for its present and future citizens.

The cradle of this great Oregon civilization was rocked in the Willamette Valley in almost recent times, May 2, 1843, to be exact, at Champoeg, north of Oregon's capital city, Salem. There, Americans and Canadians met in what has come to be known as the famous "wolf meeting" and decided to ask the United States to govern the whole Oregon country. On the spot where this meeting was held, a great monument has been erected which bears the names of all of those hardy pioneers who voted for the Stars and Stripes.

From that historic beginning, just 110 years ago, has evolved a commonwealth of which the entire Nation is proud and to which most of her sister States owe a common debt of gratitude. It was Oregon which first provided the initiative and referendum to benefit the voters of the State and to improve governmental procedures. In fact, Oregon's vast contribution to the wealth and progress of America through its great agricultural, industrial, and commercial enterprises has placed this young State among the leaders of the West.

While agriculture and forestry have been the basic sources of income in Oregon since the early days, the State is rapidly coming of age in manufacturing, with a strong trend toward diversity of industry. Metal working, textiles, paper, printing, chemicals, and stone and clay products have made pronounced advances during the past decade. This manufacturing is concentrated primarily west of the Cascade Mountains, where all but 1 county have 1,000 or more industrial workers, with 4 of them having over 5,000. Industrial advancement has created the demand for business enterprises to supply the needs of the ever-increasing number of industrial workers.

The State's two basic industries, timber and food products, have kept pace with the forward surge of manufacturing and, in fact, have contributed materially toward its advancement.

One-fifth of the lumber produced in the United States comes from Oregon where more than 8 billion board feet were cut in 1950, principally Douglas fir and Ponderosa pine. Private operators in cooperation with the Government have led the way in the sustained-yield program of permanent forest management, assuring a continuous source of timber, and economic stability to many Oregon communities which depend upon timber and timbering as their source of income.

Although much of the lumber is shipped out of the area in a rough or semifinished state, the manufacture of more highly finished wood products such as sashes, doors, roof trusses, bores, battery separators, toys, any many others, is contributing materially to industrial development. Some 30 plants now produce plywood, while another allied industry, furniture, employs 3,500 workers.

Also based on Oregon's timber resources are pulp and paper manufacturing which provide an annual payroll in excess of $14 million. All types of paper are made, including newsprint, slick magazine, wrapping, tissue, carboard and waxed, with a present trend toward the higher grades.

The second leading industry, food processing, employs one-sixth of the industrial workers. The annual pack totals over 13 million cases, leading items being green beans, peas, and corn; pears, plums, and cherries; berries, jams, jellies, preserves, and fruit juices. In addition some 120 million pounds of fruit, berries, and vegetables are quick frozen in one of the State's fastest growing industries.

Commercial fishing is centered along the coast with about 50 million pounds of fish processed annually at Astoria, alone. Chinook salmon, tuna, and quick-frozen fillets are the principal products.

In dairy processing, fresh and canned milk and butter added to the food industry totals, while Tillamook cheese and the Blue Vein cheese of Langlois have gained national recognition.

Backed by heavy wheat production in the region, flour is milled in large quantities at Astoria, The Dalles, Pendleton, and Portland, one of the Nation's leading wheat and flour exporting cities. The expanding consumer market, in conjunction with extensive milling facilities, has led to increased manufacture of crackers, cookies, cereals, and other bakery products.

Such is the diversity of manufacturing and commercial interests in the State which just a century ago was the western outpost of the Hudson's Bay Company as well as America's first giant of the fur industry, John Jacob Astor.

Agriculture and stock raising are at their best in Oregon. The mild, temperate climate of western Oregon is conducive to raising almost any crop which does not demand almost continual sunshine. And eastern Oregon, with its vast uplands, produces wheat and grain and provides great pasturelands for thousands upon thousands of cattle and sheep.

The diversity of crops raised commercially is practically limitless, as may be noted by the various products in which Oregon's production leads all other States. Winter pears, filberts, loganberries, youngberries, boysenberries, black raspberries, gooseberries, peppermint for oil, green beans, fiber flax, alsike, and ladino clover seed, and several of the cover seed crops are all produced more abundantly in Oregon than in any other State.

Scenic attractions and recreational facilities are as magnificent as may be found anywhere in the world. The silent fastnesses of lonely mountain meadows, the noisy turbulence of rushing streams; the rockbound coastlines and innumerable sandy beaches; virgin forests and newly planted orchards; the magnitude of the Columbia River Gorge and the quiet elegance of age-old Crater Lake—all these are a part of Oregon.

Snow-capped Mount Hood, with its famous Timberline Lodge, the Rogue River, favorite of fishermen who delight in gaffing a steelhead; Pendleton and its annual roundup; land of the fur traders and end of the famed Oregon Trail—these, too, are a part of Oregon.

Territorial government proclaimed in 1848; statehood achieved in 1859; the midtwentieth century finds the great State of Oregon continually developing into a tremendous agricultural and industrial empire where living is fun; where business prospers; where the future is as bright and as sure as tomorrow's sunrise.

The Honorable Douglas McKay, former Governor of Oregon and present Secretary of the Interior, prepared the following letter for publication prior to his assumption of his new post. His enviable record attained

for bringing new crops and farming practices to the attention of the farmers. In 1852 there were 300 active agricultural societies and by 1860 they numbered over 1,000.

As these societies expanded, the community, and later the county, agricultural fairs developed. Elkanah Watson promoted the first agricultural fair in Pittsfield, Mass., on October 10, 1810, with 26 farmers participating. Watson organized a society to hold annual fairs and from that date forward they became an American institution.

Printing of publications devoted to agriculture began about this same period and Congress, itself, began to take an interest in farm matters. The House established a committee on agriculture in 1820 and the Senate set up its agriculture committee in 1825.

In 1831, the reaper was invented. The steel plow, the threshing machine, and other highly useful new farm implements were coming into use, producing great changes in agricultural technology and in the Nation's economic and social life.

To finance the purchase of these new implements, the farmer had to expand his production and sales for crops. His participation and vital interest in the Nation's business and commerce grew almost overnight. Expanded crop production necessitated expanded markets.

One Agriculture Department historian records that Ellsworth's Act of getting Congress to appropriate funds for collecting agricultural information for the first time put the Government on record as providing aid to the farmer.

"Governmental aid to agriculture was at last under way," an unidentified Agriculture Department historian wrote. "The aid would progress from the increase to the regulation of production; from subsistence to commercial agriculture; from self-reliance to considerable dependence on guidance by the Government; from the exploitation to the conservation of natural resources; from traditional guesswork to the application of practical scientific knowledge; from uncoordinated individual activity to well-coordinated group action through governmental aid."

HIT STAGGERING LEVELS

That appropriation of $1,000 Ellsworth got from Congress for agriculture was all he got until 1842, when another $1,000 appropriation was made. The next 2 years, Congress voted $2,000 a year for aid to farmers, boosted this to $3,000 in 1845 but skipped making an appropriation in 1846. Since 1847 there has been an appropriation for agriculture every year. In recent years, these appropriations have been more than a billion dollars annually, total Agriculture Department expenditures running nearly $2 billion a year.

The Agriculture Department's yearly expenditures first hit these astronomically staggering levels in the last decade as it bought and sold surplus farm crops to support market prices, and as it expanded its activities in the farm credit field. Money collected in the operation of these programs is frequently poured back into other Department activities, raising total expenditures sometimes to almost double the congressional appropriations.

Agitation for the establishment of a Government agency for agriculture alone was generated in the late 1840's when the Patent Office became a part of the new Department of Interior.

SOUTHERNERS' ABSENCE HELPS

In 1852, the gentleman farmers who had sponsored the local agricultural societies met in Washington in June and organized the United States Agricultural Society, which became the most powerful force urging the establishment of a Federal Department of Agriculture.

A Department historian chronicles that "the fact that the southern delegation no longer sat in Congress naturally facilitated the passage of the bill [creating the Department in 1862] because their passion for State rights might well have defeated it."

Lincoln also signed other major legislation in 1862 which was to benefit American agriculture greatly. On May 20, he signed the homestead act apportioning freehold farms of 160 acres each from the public domain to citizens who would make homes on the land.

Then on July 2, that same year, Lincoln signed the land-grant college act, giving the States 11 million acres of public lands which were used to provide the money to found most of our present-day agricultural colleges and keep them going.

When the Department was given Cabinet rank in 1899, it comprised divisions of statistics, entomology, chemistry, silk culture, botany, vegetable pathology, economic ornithology and mammalogy, microscopy, forestry, gardens, grounds and horticulture, seed, and pomology, plus the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Office of Experiment Stations.

FREE SEEDS HALTED IN 1923

Its major contact with the farmer, however, was through the seeds it supplied to Members of Congress to mail free to their constituents. Seed companies, who found the Government an almost stifling competitor, waged a bitter battle against the free-seed program for years, usually with the assistance of the Agriculture Secretary, but it was not until 1923 that a halt was called.

Today, the Agriculture Department is in almost daily contact with every farm home in the country. Its marketing news service supplies up-to-the-hour marketing news reports and prices which are sent out to the Nation by radio, television, telegraph, teletype, telegram, telephone, and the mails.

Its Production and Marketing Administration is represented in every farming community. Meat inspectors of its Bureau of Animal Industry, entomologists from its Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, credit and grain experts from its Commodity Credit Corporation, timbermen from the Forest Service, electricians and communications specialists from the Rural Electrification Administration, agronomists from the Soil Conservation Service, and marketing specialists from the farm-extension services provide part of the daily contact the Department has with the American people.

FARM BOY BECOMES SECRETARY

Ezra Taft Benson, one of the 12 disciples of the Mormon Church, a farm boy who became a marketing specialist and was later to head one of the biggest farm cooperative trade organizations, is the present Agriculture Secretary. He draws the usual pay of a Cabinet officer, $22,500 a year, and has a Government limousine at his service.

Benson has an Assistant Secretary who draws $15,000 and three $12,200 men on his immediate staff. Most of his division chiefs are paid from $13,000 to $15,000 a year.

The agencies of the Department and their tasks follow:

The Agricultural Research Administration operates Department experiment stations, the Bureaus of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, Animal Industry, Dairy Industry, Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Human Nutrition and Home Economics, and the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soil and Agricultural Engineering. All agricultural research except economic centers here. In addition, the Agricultural Research Administration administers meat inspection, plant and animal disease prevention and control programs, and provides aid to homemakers.

CREDIT PROVIDED TO FARMERS

The Commodity Exchange Authority supervises trading in farm commodities on the speculative markets.

The Extension Service provides cooperative educational services under which the Department and the State agricultural colleges carry on educational programs on agriculture and homemaking in rural areas.

The Farm Credit Administration provides both short- and long-term credit.

Farmers Home Administration provides small farmers with credit to improve farming operations or to become farm owners.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation develops and administers crop-insurance programs.

Forest Service promotes conservation of forests, provides forest-fire prevention, and administers the national forests.

Production and Marketing Administration administers agricultural conservation, acreage allotment, marketing quotas, price supports, school lunches, surplus disposal, and other production and marketing programs.

LENDING FOR ELECTRIFICATION

Commodity Credit Corporation provides funds for carrying out price support, foreign supply, and other commodity credit programs.

Rural Electrification Administration: A lending agency which provides funds for rural electric and telephone service.

Soil Conservation Service administers soil-conservation activities, including drainage and flood-control programs.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics provides statistics on all phases of farm life and does economic research and forecasting.

Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations acquires, compiles, and interprets information on foreign agriculture, and represents the Secretary in international conferences on wheat agreements and similar pacts.

On January 22, Benson announced plans for a major overhauling of the Department, which he said had "swollen into a huge bureaucracy of 20 agencies and bureaus in the last 20 years."

"This action will make possible a closer coordination of related activities," Benson said. "What we intend is a gradual streamlining of the Department's services in the interest of economy and greater efficiency."

LUMPS ALL INTO FOUR BIG GROUPS

Benson lumped all the agencies and bureaus into four major groups headed by single administrators, as follows:

Commodity Marketing and Adjustment Group: Commodity Credit Corporation, Commodity Exchange Authority, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and Production and Marketing Administration (except agricultural conservation programs branch).

Agricultural Credit Group: Farm Credit Administration, Farmers' Home Administration, and Rural Electrification Administration.

Research, Extension, and Land-Use Group: Agricultural Research Administration, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Extension Service, Forest Service, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Soil Conservation Service, and agricultural conservation programs branch (transferred from PMA).

Departmental Administration Group: Hearing examiners, library, Office of Budget and Finance, Office of Information, Office of Personnel, and Office of Plant and Operations.

Title to Submerged Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 30, 1953

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the question that is presented in the legislation now before the House—H. R.

4198—is one that has created great interest since the Supreme Court of the United States rendered its recent decision.

The purpose of the legislation is to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf.

Similar legislation has been before the Congress several times during the last few years. It has passed the Congress on two previous occasions but was vetoed by President Truman. The question is again before the Congress. It was an issue in the last election and the principles contained in the present bill were supported by the Republican candidate in that election who is now the President of the United States. Thus, it might be said that the people have voted affirmatively on the subject. However, while in some States it could be said that the people of such States did definitely support General Eisenhower because of his favorable stand on the matter, yet it might be considered a bit overdrawn to say that it in itself determined his election. But in any event it must be admitted that it was one of the outstanding issues that had a very direct effect on the voting.

Unfortunately, there are many collateral considerations that enter into the determination of the matter at this time. An illustration of this is the persistence with which advocates of school aid look upon Government ownership of the disputed submerged lands as a distinct aid to our schools. There is no one who will deny that the need for such aid exists, but there is nothing inherent in ownership by the Federal Government that makes it definite or any more certain that such aid to schools will follow Federal ownership. In fact, there has been little if anything in recent happenings to justify or even encourage the thought. On the contrary, there is nothing that would preclude our several States from granting similar aid to schools within their boundaries if title to the disputed lands was placed in them as this legislation contemplates. In fact, as the support of schools has been historically an obligation of our State governments there is much more likelihood that such lands in State ownership could and would be more likely to provide aid to our needy schools.

It has been contended with much sincerity that as the United States Supreme Court has decided that the submerged lands bounding our several States and the natural resources incident to them belong to the Federal Government, then that decision should settle the matter once and for all. It is my opinion that while such a viewpoint is generally sound, yet it does not, and should not, preclude the Representatives in Congress legislating on the subject. Thus, there is no doubt whatsoever in my mind that the Congress has the right to legislate on the subject now before us. This is particularly true when it is considered that all through our history as a nation it has been generally believed and considered that the title to the submerged lands within the recognized international lines of our coastal States, as well as those beneath the inland waters of any State, were owned by the respective States. Until the recent decisions of our Supreme Court in the cases of California, Louisiana, and Texas, the ownership in the several States had been generally accepted, acknowledged, and observed. The right of States to consider such lands as their own to dispose of, regulate, and control, has never been questioned. The fact that this general acceptance of State ownership has prevailed since we became a nation lends strength to the argument that it is neither right nor just at this late day to change what has become established by usage and acceptance through more than a century and a half of time. If there is anything, the very nature of things requires to be permanent, it is title to land. Security in title is fundamental to sound government.

Unfortunately, advocates of Federal ownership have sought to gain by a gross misstatement of the fundamental principles that underlie the question at issue. In this way it has been made to appear that the present legislation is an effort to rob the people of our Nation of valuable lands for the benefit of a few oil companies. This is so far from the truth that it seems unbelievable that thoughtful people could be misled.

Never until the recent decisions of the Supreme Court has any question ever been raised as to the title of the several States in the submerged lands that come within the provisions of this legislation. Does it mean nothing that through all the years of our history it was conceded by all in authority, as well as those trained in the law, that title was in the States and not in the Federal Government? Through all of these years the States have treated such lands as their own. Grants have been made, leases executed, licenses and permits entered into whereby individuals have been given the right to use and enjoy such property in the respective States in the manner and to the extent determined by each State. The Federal Government has never during all such time ever objected to, or raised any question or doubt as to the full right of the several States to deal with such lands as owner. Thus, would it not seem that this long period of acquiescence is clear acknowledgment upon the part of the Federal Government that it did not possess ownership rights in the lands and that the States did have such rights? Thus, the legislation in question in effect is doing nothing more than to establish in the people of the several States their rights in submerged lands within the territorial limits of their respective States. It is taking nothing from the people. It merely confirms the right of the people of the several States to their own lands.

In the past, as in the present, the support for the adoption of legislation, similar to that now pending before the Congress, has been so general and from so many varied organizations, that it might be said that it was almost unanimous. As an indication of this unanimity of opinion upon the part of national groups, I mention the following organizations in favor of the legislation: the Council of State Governments, the Governors Conference, National Association of Public Land Officials, National Association of County Officials, National Conference of Mayors, American Association of Port Authorities, the American Bar Association, American Title Association, United States Chamber of Commerce, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, National Water Conservation Association, American Municipal Association, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.

In conclusion, it is my careful and studied opinion that it is necessary and appropriate under existing conditions that leave title to submerged lands in a state of uncertainty as a result of the Supreme Court decisions of recent date, to adopt legislation that will declare:

First. The people of the several States own all lands beneath navigable waters within the historical boundaries of their respective States, subject only to the Federal powers of regulation and control for the purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense and international affairs.

Second. Federal governmental powers or so-called paramount rights shall never be asserted or exercised in such manner as to take ownership or rights of ownership away from the people of the several States or from individuals without due process of law.

By the acceptance of the above principles, based upon legal principles well established, the rights of our people in the several States are thereby safeguarded for the common good. The use that shall be made of the lands and the distribution of the revenues arising therefrom, for education or otherwise, is thereby continued under the control of our State governments as it has been throughout our entire history as a nation.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 1, 1953

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Justice for Poland, delivered by Hon. Christian Herter, Governor of Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

(Address by Hon. Christian Herter, Governor of Massachusetts)

Thank you very much for your kind words of introduction.

I also want to express my heartfelt thanks to the Polish American Congress for giving me the privilege of addressing you through the medium of this radio program.

We have a new administration in Washington.

This administration is headed by a man who has labored brilliantly and productively

Maligning the McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 1, 1953

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to introduce into the RECORD an editorial which appeared on March 25, 1953, in the Passaic (N. J.) Herald News:

MALIGNING THE MCCARRAN-WALTER ACT

Eben Takamine, of Ridgewood, president of the Clifton laboratories which bear his illustrious father's name, became an American citizen last week, a privilege denied to him for most of his 63 years.

His mother was an American, the daughter of Col. Eben Hitch, of New Orleans, a southern officer in the Civil War. His father was Dr. Jokichi Takamine, the great Japanese-American scientist who discovered the life-saving drug, adrenalin, and the chemical industry's starch-digestant, takadiastase. The elder Takamine was once described by Dr. John H. Finley, then editor of the New York Times, as "the interpreter of Japan's gratitude to the United States." The pallbearers at Dr. Takamine's funeral in St. Patrick's Cathedral on July 25, 1922, were some of the greatest Americans of that decade.

Eben Takamine was born in Tokyo, when his father was showing the Japanese how to make artificial fertilizer from phosphate rock. His parents returned to the States when he was 1 year old. Had he been born in Passaic, where his father lived for many years, he would have acquired American citizenship automatically. But the accident of birth in Tokyo made him ineligible for naturalization under the oriental exclusion acts of the 1880's. The McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, which went into effect on Christmas Eve, 1952, opened the door for him and for others. He was the first Japanese national to become a citizen in New Jersey.

Before the McCarran-Walter Act was passed, a Senate subcommittee held lengthy hearings and a staff of experts spent 3 years studying and codifying our immigration laws. The only opposition expressed during the hearings came from two organizations listed as subversive by Federal agencies. The Daily Worker, the Communist Party organ, attacked the bill because it provided means of screening out Red spies, saboteurs and troublemakers.

When the House passed the bill, 206 to 68, leftist-liberal "molders of opinion"—commentators, actors, and fellow-travelers—began screaming for a Presidential veto and urging support for the Humphrey-Lehman substitute. The Humphrey-Lehman bill would have opened the floodgates to practically unrestricted immigration, scrapping the national origins quota system. The McCarran bill retained that system but its use of the year 1920 as a computation base was criticized because it did not reflect present day percentages. President Truman vetoed the bill. Congress repassed it over the veto.

Some weeks ago there was a vivid demonstration of the way television—so useful as an educational medium when properly employed—can be misused.

It happened during a presentation of the Columbia network's See It Now program over channel two. The narrator, Edward R. Murrow, had presented an excellent half-hour show, which included Enrico Fermi and other nuclear physicists who built Chicago University's atomic pile when groups of scientists were trying to build the A-bomb. It was factual stuff, vivid and convincing. Signing off in his dead-serious way, Mr. Murrow reminded his viewers that the Chicago experimentation happened 10 years ago. "Were it today," he said, "with the McCarran-Walter Act in effect, Dr. Fermi might not have been able to come to the United States to collaborate in that great effort."

Mr. Murrow knows, or should know, that what he said was not true. The McCarran-Walter Act does not keep professors out of the United States (unless they happen to be Communists). The law makes it easier for professors and for all persons with special skills to be admitted. The first half of every nation's quota of immigrants is reserved for desirable immigrants like Enrico Fermi—skilled technicians, teachers, farmers, and others readily assimilable into our society. No longer is it necessary for a professor to get a temporary entry permit. Now he can get a permanent visa.

Mr. Murrow should know this. If he doesn't, he shouldn't be Columbia's oracle for the millions.

Communism in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 1, 1953

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Premier de Gasperi is to be commended for the telling blow his Government has dealt to Communist hopes for a victory in the coming national elections in Italy. Fully cognizant of the crisis which would be created by a stalemate in the next election, the De Gasperi government has taken the bull by the horns and changed the electoral law despite the threats and sound and fury by the Communists.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger of March 31 lauding the action of the De Gasperi government:

HARD-HITTING ACTION

The De Gasperi government of Italy has succeeded in hitting Communist power the heaviest blow it has suffered in any European country since the end of the war with Nazi Germany.

The Italian Government has struck hard at the source of much of Communist power in Italy. By changing the electoral law, the Government has deprived the Communists of the hope of creating a stalemate in the next election.

Communist power in Italy, as in France, had fed largely on the ability of the Communists to create confusion, to frighten opponents, and intimidate non-Communist masses, and to create the impression that the Communists represent the "wave of the future."

Now, with the new electoral law, the Government is assured of a substantial working majority in Parliament if it can succeed in obtaining more than 50 percent of the popular vote. The power of a minority to throw the Government into frustrating deadlock has been definitely curtailed.

The De Gasperi government has shown commendable vigor in combating Communist violence and intimidation. If it can manage to be equally fruitful in solving some of Italy's economic problems, it will reduce Communist influence in Italy to a minimum. There is no reason to believe the Italian people tend to acceptance of Communist affiliation when not driven to it.

Submerged Lands Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 1, 1953

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, upon assuming office in January of this year, I was immediately confronted with many letters and personal inquiries as to what my views and opinions were in connection with the controversial tidelands oil issue. To all of these inquisitors my reply has been the same: I have not as yet made up my mind. I want time to investigate and weigh all the arguments and issues on both sides. Like a jury, I want to have all the facts before me before rendering my verdict.

For the past 3 months I have carefully and methodically studied this question of whether the Federal Government or the States involved should own these submerged coastal lands out to the States' historical seaward boundaries.

Now, however, the time has arrived to speak out and make my views known. For the past 3 days in the House of Representatives some of the most able legal minds in our country have given voice to their views as to where the ownership of these offshore lands should be vested. It is now time to stand up and be counted. And it is with deep humility and sincerity that I choose to cast my vote for State ownership of these lands.

The decision has not been an easy one to reach because the issue has been so clouded with irrelevant arguments, misnomers, half-truths, and deliberate lies.

For instance, the tidelands, that area of the shore washed by the ebb and flow of the tides, is really not involved in this dispute at all. The Federal Government fully recognizes that the States have full and perfect title to these tidelands, but the real dispute exists over that area from low tide out to the 3-mile limit or, in the case of Texas and west Florida, out 3 marine leagues or approximately 10½ miles. Likewise, the falsehood has been widely spread that the big oil companies are behind the drive for State ownership. In reality it does not matter to the oil producers one iota whether their leases for exploration or development of offshore oil deposits are made with the Federal or State Governments because in the end the costs of leasing this property will be exactly the same, regardless of where ownership is finally placed.

False arguments have also been advanced that if these lands are given to the States then our national defense will be jeopardized. Of course nothing could be further from the truth because practically all of the oil and fuel being used by the Defense Department is presently being furnished by domestic State producers and in case of a national emergency, just as during World War II, the entire oil production could be mobilized for national defense.

Another fabrication advanced by those lobbying for Federal ownership is that the Supreme Court has not held that the

States owned these lands. The truth of the matter is that State ownership of these submerged lands has been approved by the United States Supreme Court on 53 occasions and by lower Federal and State courts 244 times prior to the California decision.

Still other false arguments for Federal ownership is that the oil is needed for educational purposes, that affirming State ownership of these lands would be a gift or a big steal, and that only Republicans are sponsoring this legislation. The educational provision has been introduced into this controversy in the hope of arousing support of the country's educators. However, the amendment proposed by Senator HILL to S. 107, a bill introduced in this connection would only make funds available for educational purposes if and when the need for national defense purposes no longer exist. Also, even if all the revenue received from present offshore oil production were diverted to educational purposes, it would provide each year only about 67 cents for each school child in the United States.

There is no gift or steal involved in affirming the States rights to property which has from time immemorial been regarded as belonging to the States concerned. Democrats have been as actively supporting legislation in favor of State ownership of offshore oil deposits as have the Republican Party. The voting record in the Congress since 1946 will bear out and prove this fact.

My decision in voting for State ownership of the lands in question has been tempered and controlled by many considerations. In this brief statement I can only outline and enumerate a few of the reasons which have guided my thinking in arriving at this conclusion.

First. As a Representative of the State of Utah, I have considered the views, judgment, and desires of the people of my district who have in their letters and conversations conveyed to me the impression that the majority of the people favor State rather than Federal ownership of these lands.

Second. I believe State ownership can be founded upon right, equity, and justice and that any other course would illegally divest title from the States and leaseholders who have held and claimed title to this property from the time when these coastal States were admitted to the Union and even preceding these dates.

There was no question in anyone's mind but what the title to this land was invested in the States until 1936 when the Secretary of the Interior reversed all previous court decisions and legal opinions, including his own, to hold that these lands and newly discovered oil thereon should belong to the Federal Government. A few years later a New Deal Supreme Court affirmed Secretary Ickes' Federal land grab of these State lands. I believe the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases were patently wrong. I do not deny the power of the Court to render such an opinion, but I firmly believe that it is time for the legislative branch to correct this situation and reaffirm the States title to these lands.

Third. Affirming the States rights to these lands is in accord with constitutional government and is in keeping with the intents of our Founding Fathers who saw the wisdom in including in article X of the Constitution the following statement:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Fourth. A vote for State ownership will prevent the trend toward socialization and control of our industries which has been increasing for the past 20 years. A vote for Federal ownership would continue to increase the power of the Federal Government at the expense of the States, and might well establish a pattern and trend toward even greater Federal ownership and control over purely local and State matters.

Fifth. The President, his Cabinet, and the majority of Congress, including Democrats and Republicans alike, have all seen the wisdom and fairness in affirming State ownership. We have always recognized that Government must be based upon the will and expression of the majority. The people of the United States have also expressed their views on this issue by electing a majority of Republicans to office on a platform containing a plank for States rights to these offshore oil deposits.

Sixth. The settlement of the offshore submerged lands dispute in favor of State ownership is only one phase of the revaluation of the entire Federal land ownership problem. At the present time over 50 percent of the land area in the 11 Western States is owned by the Federal Government. In Utah the problem is really more acute in that approximately 73 percent of all land in the State is controlled by one Federal agency or another. The future growth of the West, and particularly Utah, is dependent on the development of our natural resources. I sincerely believe State ownership will aid Utah and the inhabitants thereof in eventually obtaining title to more of the public domain in Utah. For the sake of consistency I could not argue for Federal ownership of these offshore lands and still try to achieve our objective of returning at least part of the public domain in Utah to control of the State and private citizens thereof.

Seventh. The State governments can more economically explore and develop these oil deposits, and benefits in turn will accrue to all States. It is a known fact that few, if any, Federal bureaus ever operate at a profit, and we have no reason to believe Federal ownership and administration of these off-shore lands would be any exception.

Eighth. The arguments advanced by the proponents of Federal ownership is the same thinly veiled argument advanced by socialistic and communistic land reformers in Russia and other totalitarian countries—that the land belongs to all the people and, consequently, everyone should share in its exploitation. These "share the wealth" plans are as old as Adam and no amount of argument will ever justify this seizure of State or private lands by the Federal Government as long as we have free and enlightened people who believe in constitutional government.

Ninth. State ownership will not in any way interfere with the national sovereignty of the United States in providing police power or naval protection to the shores of our country, nor will it in any way interfere with Federal regulation of navigation on this portion of the coastline. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution clearly empowers the Federal Government to regulate commerce and to provide and maintain a Navy and to make rules and regulations pertaining thereto, so these vital functions will not in any way be jeopardized.

Tenth. In conclusion, long hours of research, deliberation, and meditation have convinced me that I must vote for affirmation of State ownership of the offshore lands out to State historical boundaries because it is fundamentally and basically correct. There is no other course which in good conscience I can pursue and still serve the people of the State of Utah, and uphold the Constitution of the United States, which I, as a Congressman, have sworn to defend. There is no substitute for justice and right. And I sincerely believe that any other course would subvert the best interests of both country and our individual citizens to the will of the minority.

A Word About Adlai E. Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 1, 1953

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from What Do the Democrats Do Now? by John Fischer in Harper's magazine of March 1953:

A WORD ABOUT ADLAI E. STEVENSON

The touchy relationship with Congress may ease a little when one large group of southerners discovers that Stevenson's views are much closer to their own than they had ever imagined.

In many respects he is a genuine conservative. This fact never emerged very clearly during the campaign, because it was impossible for Stevenson to disentangle himself from the Truman administration and its record; because a few members of Americans for Democratic Action—the so-called New Dealers in exile—joined his staff; and because the opposition press naturally tried to paint him as a dangerous radical. The truth is that when he talks about economy, he really means it. He believes in States' rights just as profoundly as Thomas Jefferson. His instinctive attitude toward organized labor probably is closer to that of the Democratic Congressmen than to Walter Reuther's.

The two new ideas which he tried to inject into the campaign got little notice—perhaps because they sounded so strange on the lips of a Democratic candidate. One of them was a demand for a sharp reversal of the drift toward centralized power in Washington. The other was a plan for reconciliation between Government and the business community.

He spoke in deadly earnest when he told a startled crowd in Reading, Pa., that he

had been a corporation lawyer much of his life and "never had to wrestle with my conscience." He repudiated the ancient political trick of picturing businessmen as malefactors of great wealth, with water in their stock and monopoly in their eye—and he added that "we must sweep out of the corridors of Government * * * those lingering suspicions which are a holdover from an earlier and very different time."

Recognition of Civil Defense Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 1, 1953

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been commended by Gen. William Hesketh, director, Connecticut Office of Civil Defense, for bringing to public attention the apathy in our preparations for protection of the civilian population.

Volunteer workers in the civil-defense program are accomplishing a tremendous amount of good for our Nation by their efforts, but their numbers are yet too small to be truly effective. Most local and State constituted civil-defense offices are also working diligently to alert our citizens to the dangers of neglect in preparation for enemy attack. Connecticut is fortunate to be endowed with capable people in this regard.

I hope that other Members of Congress will realize the public-education job which must be done to bring our civil-defense program up to a standard which affords some degree of protection against an aggressor. We must speak out, and supplement our words with deeds by furnishing the funds necessary for this purpose.

The letter follows:

MARCH 30, 1953.

Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: I have noted with interest and appreciation your recent statement warning that some Connecticut counties do not have enough volunteers to man Ground Observer Corps posts.

Your statement, and also your timely warning against complacency in the civil-defense effort, appeared in several State newspapers in the last few days.

At the present time the Ground Observer Corps in Connecticut is not a part of the State civil-defense office. We have, however, proposed a bill in the current legislature which will integrate these forces into the overall program if passed by the general assembly.

Your appeal for civilian cooperation in the civil-defense effort soon after viewing the atomic-bomb tests in Nevada comes at a very appropriate time.

It is a difficult problem to overcome the nationwide apathy that apparently exists in the defense effort. It certainly helps, however, when a member of the Atomic Energy Commission and Armed Services Committee speaks out so aggressively in favor of it.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM HESKETH,
Director, Office of Civil Defense.

Submerged Lands Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. CONDON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 30, 1953

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of my father-in-law necessitates my absence from the vote on the so-called tidelands oil bill. Inasmuch as the position I plan to take by leaving a live pair is contrary to the position of most of my colleagues from California, and of the State of California, a respect for their judgment compels me to state briefly the reason for my stand.

The Supreme Court has held that the Federal interest in the submerged oil lands is paramount to that of the bordering States. Although there is a technical difference between a paramount interest and title to the land, for practical purposes it seems to me the Federal Government has been declared as the owner of the submerged lands to the historical boundaries. I disapprove greatly of the growing movement of giving to the States or to private interests the rights and control over our tremendously important public domain. If the Congress can make a gift of the submerged lands, I see no reason why they cannot give away the mineral and oil right to the States or private interests under all of the public lands of the United States. This I oppose.

In the second place, oil is the most important sinew of war in a world which is threatened with a global world war III. As a soldier in World War II, I saw a military nation crumble for lack of oil. Obviously, in the next war we have no assurances of receiving imports of oil from the Near East, and even our possibility of obtaining oil in South America would seem vulnerable. Accordingly, I strongly believe that the Federal Government should have under strict control the oil deposits presently under its dominion.

Finally, I think there are greater problems of international conflicts which may be engendered if an attempt is made to stretch the States' taxing power to the end of the Continental Shelf. I think retaliation by other governments would certainly jeopardize substantial fishing interests, and perhaps have consequences that the proponents of the States' position have failed to realize.

Senator Lehman's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY A. FINE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 1, 1953

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN reached his 75th birthday, and I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD an editorial in the New York Times of that date extending him good wishes and giving, in brief, the splendid record and achievements of our junior Senator from New York. The editorial follows:

SENATOR LEHMAN'S BIRTHDAY

HERBERT H. LEHMAN, who reaches his 75th birthday today, has had three careers; one in private business, which he relinquished a quarter of a century ago; one in philanthropic enterprises, which goes back to the early days of his youth; one in public service, during which he has been successively Lieutenant Governor and Governor of the State of New York, a director of relief and rehabilitation for the State Department, Director-General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and United States Senator.

To all that he has done he brought a keen intelligence, a humane spirit and an urgent sense of responsibility. He has been a politician in the sense that he has voted and acted as a Democrat, and in his ability to be elected and reelected, but his public career dignifies an abused word. There was little artfulness in his four campaigns for the governorship or in his campaigns for the Senate. All he had to do was to present his record, his plans, and his hopes in the quiet and persuasive manner natural to him. He inspires trust. One may disagree with some of his views but never with his principles. When these are involved he will break with party, as he did when he opposed the Roosevelt Supreme Court plan.

His senatorial term has nearly 4 years to run. It is a pleasure to note that his health and energy are unimpaired. He is needed where he is, and good wishes for him are good wishes for his constituents and his country.

Mr. Speaker, Senator LEHMAN has identified himself with every worthy cause brought to his attention during his incumbency as Lieutenant Governor, Governor, and Senator from our great State of New York. As Frank Kingdon so well stated in the New York Post:

As Lieutenant Governor, Governor, and United States Senator, he has so identified himself with the moving currents reshaping our society into a socially conscious modern state that many of us find part of our own identification in his thought and action. The ageless gifts of courage, independence, conscientiousness and intellectual adventurousness are his, with the result that there is no age barrier in our appreciation of him. He has the wisdom of years but it shines with anticipation of tomorrow's dawn.

We do not have to tell each other that HERBERT LEHMAN is a superb public servant. We all know it. Nevertheless we repeat it. We repeat it because when we speak of great and famous men we stir in ourselves the memories and moods that quicken us to nobler citizenship in ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, may he remain with us very many years to continue his selfless, conscientious, and humanitarian work for peoples of all creeds and nations.

Submerged Lands Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 30, 1953

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, as a Californian who represents some 400,000 citi-

outstanding, and we all hope for him many years of happiness and success in the future. I am happy to include the following citation which accompanied the awarding of the degree:

GEORGE A. SMATHERS

A leader of Florida who has served his State and Nation with great distinction; a loyal member of the church with a deep and abiding interest in the welfare of his fellow man; a graduate of our University of Florida who has been a member of the State bar since 1938, having interrupted his career to serve with the United States Marine Corps in World War II, advancing from the rank of lieutenant to that of major, later serving as assistant to the Attorney General for the prosecution of war fraud cases; a Member of the 80th and 81st Congresses, representing the Fourth Florida District, and during which years his statesmanship won national acclaim; presently the junior Florida Senator in the Senate of the United States, where his leadership qualities have ever been in evidence; a leader of Florida with courage, foresight, loyalty, and the practice of high principles in all of his daily affairs.

For all of these, and many other accomplishments, Florida Southern College is proud to confer upon the Hon. GEORGE A. SMATHERS the degree of doctor of laws.

Submerged Lands Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 30, 1953

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to voice my opposiiton to the bill under discussion—H. R. 4198—the so-called submerged lands bill, which establishes title in the States to the lands and the resources therein beneath the coastal navigable waters. The aim and purpose of this bill is contrary to the philosophy that property held in trust shall be managed and controlled for the benefit of those for whom the trust has been created, namely, the American people.

In recent years the United States Supreme Court has handed down three decisions declaring that the Federal Government has paramount right and sovereignty over the submerged lands and their resources along the coasts of the United States. First, it was in 1947 in the case of California; then in 1950 in the cases of Louisiana and Texas. The undeniable implication contained in all three decisions is that the jurisdiction over these lands and the title to them and their resources are vested under international law in the whole people of the United States.

Several attempts were made to defy the Supreme Court's decisions, which are based on legal precedent. Twice the Congress sought to reverse the Supreme Court on a basic question of international law, and twice President Truman vetoed the so-called quitclaim bill to hand over the offshore oil lands to the States. Now we have a similar proposal under consideration which seeks to make an outright gift of our offshore oil resources to 3 or 4 States.

We cannot divest the citizens of this country of their rights and controls over the resources of this Nation. What is in the interests and for the benefit of the whole people cannot be taken away from them and given to a few States where only a relatively few individuals will profit at the expense of the entire Nation. The deprivation by the Congress of the rights of all American citizens, which rights in this instance are worth many billions of dollars, is contrary to the principles laid down in our Constitution and inconsistent with the principles of the law of nature of a well ordered society.

By handing over this rich offshore oil property to a few States, the present Congress will go down in American history as having committed a great disservice to the American people and setting a dangerous precedent for the future. In so doing, we shall lay the foundation for the inland States to similarly grab title to all reserved minerals, valuable national properties, and other natural resources which are now held in trust for all the people by our Federal Government.

It is well worth keeping in mind that if the current movement, instigated by the oil lobby, should eventually prove to be successful and the resources of the submerged lands are ceded to the States—actually, it means to private oil companies in those States—it will encourage other groups who are waiting to move in on the public domain for their personal enrichment. There are those who want the Federal grazing lands put under State control, others seek State control over our national forests, and still others cannot understand why Federal lands containing valuable mineral resources are not given to the States. The argument that these grazing lands, the national forests and the mineral resources under public domain never belonged to the States, holds true also in the case of offshore oil resources which never belonged to the States. Consequently, there is no logic to the claim that they be returned to the States.

I am unalterably opposed to this bill because, in my opinion, it constitutes a most fantastic conspiracy to deprive the American people of its natural resources and natural wealth, which are an integral part of the national heritage of this Nation just as are its Constitution and form of government, its belief in freedom and its way of life. The people, the land, the government—they are all one and inseparable, they are the United States.

The Nation as a whole is in a much better position to exploit and utilize most beneficially the resources along and under our coastal waters. For one thing, these resources are needed for defense purposes and should be conserved as much as possible, instead of being wasted as would be the case under State control. If, in the event of a new world conflagration, we should suddenly discover that we were cut off from the oil of the Middle East or of the Caribbean area, or both, we would then be forced to fall back upon our own oil resources, in this case primarily the emergency reserves from our offshore lands. It is therefore imperative that some of this oil production be kept in reserve for just such an emergency.

Another major reason for Federal control is the proposal to devote the income from offshore oil, reputed to be worth upward of $40 billion, for purposes of education, for the construction of school buildings and extending grants-in-aid for education in all the 48 States. Another suggestion is to use the revenue from this source for paying off the national debt and thereby reduce the taxes for all citizens.

We are sitting here today in the Congress of the United States as the trustees of our national resources in the name of all the people of this country. Abdication on the part of Congress of its trust duties over property in which the whole Nation is interested would constitute a most flagrant violation of and departure from justice and the American tradition of fair play. It would be as unconscionable a breach of trust as has ever been perpetrated upon the American people in its long and glorious history.

Mr. Speaker, there is not one iota of reason or one scintilla of justice to support the passage of this monstrous measure. Every vote against this bill will be recorded in American history as a vote against the United States and the American people.

New Cabinet Department and Patronage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 1, 1953

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an article by Dick Preston in the Washington Daily News of March 31, 1953. Mr. Preston in the final paragraph gives the reason for the Republican somersaults we witnessed recently when our colleagues on the other side of the aisle ate all the ugly words they had said about a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 3 years ago and dutifully voted for what they said was very bad when President Truman proposed it. The reason is, as Mr. Preston implies, there are 38,000 civil-service jobs which otherwise could not go on the Republican patronage shelf.

The article follows:

The newest Cabinet Department—Health, Education, and Welfare—is a lusty baby even though it was just born yesterday.

Already, in the form of the independent Federal Security Agency, it touches directly the lives of more Americans than most old-line Cabinet Departments.

The new Department will pay social-security benefits to millions of United States workers and their survivors, help States support the aged, the blind, the crippled, and the orphaned, run the United States Public Health Service and the Office of Education, enforce the pure food and drug laws and do a number of other things.

It will be the only Cabinet Department which is primarily in the business of giving

First Step Back Toward Intergovernmental Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 2, 1953

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend and congratulate President Eisenhower for his wise action on Monday in sending to the Congress a special message recommending creation of a commission to study relationships among Federal, State, and local governments.

This proposal is clear proof of the Eisenhower administration's sincere concern for the taxpayers. President Eisenhower's message strikes directly at one of the basic causes of today's back-breaking taxation—namely, the fantastic duplication and overlapping by Federal, State, and local government units. In dozens of competing fields there are competing activities by the Federal Government, States, counties, cities, townships, and villages. To finance this profusion of governmental agencies, there is an equally confusing and burdensome array of taxes. In one State, for example, gasoline is taxed four times—by the Federal Government, the State, counties, and cities.

President Eisenhower's proposal is a long first step back toward intergovernmental *sanity*.

Do Not Let Oil Gum Up Our Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 30, 1953

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, oil is a gooey substance. It can grease the works, but it can also gum them up.

We are witnessing today an attempt to gum up our thinking with oil.

This bill now attempted to be made more palatable by referring to submerged lands instead of tidelands oil, is just as bad as every other giveaway bill that has ever been presented to the Congress.

Indeed, it is worse. It is the biggest giveaway of national resources ever attempted.

I say "giveaway" most charitably. Harsher and stronger language would be more appropriate, though possibly not as parliamentary.

Nevertheless, I impugn the motives of no Member whose views differ from mine.

I beg of each of them, however, that they put national interest above State interest, the interest of the many above that of the few, the interest of the lobbyless against the interest of the lobbyfull.

A vote against this bill is a vote for a better and a stronger America.

Do not let oil gum up our thinking.

United States Forest-Service Program in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 31, 1953

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter and statement of policy adopted by the delegates of the Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs concerning the five-point policy regarding State and university programs, private forestry programs, and Federal forestry activities within Illinois. The letter and statement of policy from Mr. Royal B. McClelland, executive secretary of the Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, follow:

ILLINOIS FEDERATION OF SPORTSMEN'S CLUBS,
March 30, 1953.

Congressman MELVIN PRICE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PRICE: At our recent annual meeting the delegates from our member clubs unanimously adopted a forestry policy. A copy of it is enclosed.

Our five-point policy applies to the State and university programs, private forestry programs and to the Federal forestry activities within Illinois. The Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, conducts 3 very important programs in our States. These are:

1. Cooperation with our State division of forestry in fire prevention, production of young trees for planting on private lands and technical assistance to private forest owners.

2. The Shawnee National Forest in southern Illinois, which supplies large volumes of timber to support local industries, cooperates with State groups in wildlife management and provides recreational areas for the public.

3. A forest research center at Carbondale, Ill., that determines the facts needed in protecting, managing, harvesting and utilizing our forest resources. A large part of this work is done in cooperation with the State division of forestry, Southern Illinois University, University of Illinois, and private industry.

We feel that these are very worthwhile activities and that they make vital contributions to our State. Also, we firmly believe that they should be continued at their present level, as a minimum, or expanded if at all possible. The appropriations for the Forest Service for the next year will be prepared during the near future by the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. Congressman CARL E. ANDERSEN is chairman of this subcommittee and the above three programs are listed in the Forest Service section of the United States Department of Agriculture budget.

We have written to Mr. Andersen, pointing out our interest and asking for his consideration when preparing the budget. We would appreciate very much your calling on him and requesting his cooperation in obtaining favorable response to our request.

Very truly yours,
ROYAL B. MCCLELLAND,
Executive Secretary,
Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs.

FORESTRY POLICY STATEMENT, ILLINOIS FEDERATION OF SPORTSMEN'S CLUBS

Our Federation appreciates the need to develop and maintain proper relationships between water, soils, and plants for the successful management of all forms of fishes and wildlife. We recognize, also, that land ownership carries with it an increasing responsibility to sustain all of these resources. In order to protect these resources, to insure their continuity and to maintain the benefits they provide for the people, we recommend:

1. A well-financed, vigorous program of research in forestry and allied fields, including forest and range management, rehabilitation of denuded lands, fire control and prevention, and the control of insects and diseases.

2. Accelerated action programs to control forest fires, and to provide for technical assistance to farmers in woodland management.

3. Efficient, properly financed management of publicly owned forest, range, and wild lands.

4. The development and maintenance of conditions favorable for private ownership and management of forest, range, and wild lands.

5. We favor continued public ownership and practical management of those public lands already dedicated to wildlife, forestry, range, watershed, and recreational uses.

Unemployment in Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 31, 1953

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter and resolution:

MASSACHUSETTS STATE COUNCIL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL
ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
March 28, 1953.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Unemployment in the textile industry, Lawrence, Mass.

DEAR SIR: The Massachusetts State Council of the International Association of Machinists represents thousands of workers within this Commonwealth.

At a meeting assembled in Boston today, the condition of unemployment in the textile industry in New England and particularly in Lawrence, Mass., was discussed at length.

Nearly 10,000 workers are now unemployed in that industry in the city of Lawrence, Mass.

This condition reflects itself in potential unemployment in other industrial fields.

A resolution was passed at our meeting today (copy enclosed) which has for its purpose the initiation of a move to alleviate the condition complained of by assigning Government contracts to the mills in Lawrence.

This office has been instructed to respectfully request you to assist through your office and through the United States Congress to the end that this critical condition in an important industrial city will be lightened or eliminated.

Thanking you in anticipation of compliance with this request and assuring you that our people look with hope and trust toward you for help, I am

Yours truly,
FRANK L. DAVIS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Whereas there is a very high figure of unemployment in the textile industry in the

while neglecting and submerging the intercontinental bomber—the only weapon we have capable of striking at the very heart of an enemy.

That's where most of our $160 billion have gone. The real defense job remains to be accomplished.

When do we start? When shall we stop pouring billions upon billions down the Pentagon rathole of "an eventual climactic ground attack"?

Is the air age here? Or is the Pentagon still living with the textbooks of Hannibal and Caesar?

Speed Line for Southern New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 30, 1953

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, providing a system of high-speed transportation for southern New Jersey is of paramount importance to the people of that portion of the State. The development of that whole area would be greatly accelerated by such a system. For many years it has been advocated by public bodies and civic organizations of every type and kind. Legislation to facilitate it has been adopted by the Legislature of New Jersey and the Congress of the United States. Yet, after all these years of combined effort the program remains stymied as a result of inactivity upon the part of the Delaware River Port Authority and its predecessors.

I enclose as part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the Courier-Post newspaper, Camden, N. J., issue of Wednesday, April 1, 1953, which emphasizes the duty of the port authority to get busy and do something about it. The editorial reads as follows:

PORT AUTHORITY PRODDED ON SPEED LINE PROGRAM

The New Jersey Assembly has just gone unanimously on record in urging the Delaware River Port Authority to hasten the construction of a high-speed transit network in south Jersey.

The assembly voted approval of a resolution to that effect by Assemblyman C. William Haines, of Burlington County, who told fellow members that the swift development of the rapid transit plan was the only way by which south Jersey could realize its full industrial-residential potential.

Haines pointed out that it now has been more than 5 years since the submission of the Knappen engineers' report, which called for extension of the existing speed line on Camden Bridge from its present terminal at Broadway and Carman Street in four directions—to Glassboro, to Clementon, to Haddonfield, and to Moorestown—utilizing present railroad trackage.

"The fulfillment of this plan," said Haines, "would implement the industrial and residential development of south Jersey by facilitating transportation between the area and metropolitan Philadelphia. Also, by an extensive use of nonhighway facilities, it would considerably eliminate highway congestion."

Haines also emphasized that under legislation passed last year the port authority has full powers to go ahead with the rapid-transit plan, including the right of eminent domain, and to extend the speed lines to all communities possible within a 35-mile radius of Camden.

Railroad officials have pledged their cooperation with the port authority in the rapid transit program.

There can be no doubt that the speed lines are an absolute necessity for this area.

The continuing growth of motor traffic and the inability of highway construction to keep pace with it are convincing proof of that necessity which has been visible for years, not needing the further evidence of it demonstrated in the last few weeks in previews of what traffic in 1953 and the years after it is going to be on our roads.

The port authority naturally has been concentrating recently on plans for the new bridge at Gloucester City, but it should at the same time be going full speed ahead on the rapid-transit program.

The legislature understands the necessity, and the legislature's urging should galvanize the port authority into immediate action.

Tidelands Oil Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 2, 1953

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House voted to give away Federal-owned oil reserves, valued at billions of dollars, to four States for the benefit of the greedy oil companies. In so doing, the House rejected a substitute proposal which would have made available 37½ percent of the oil royalties to the public schools of America. In short, the rich and selfish and greedy get this bonanza, but the children of America receive the cold shoulder.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a very timely editorial from the March 26 edition of the Free Press of Chisholm, Minn.:

PLEASE DON'T TRADE EDUCATION, MR. PRESIDENT

Tidelands oil may seem like an unimportant issue to most Americans, but it really isn't. It not only concerns at least $67.5 billion of our vital natural resources, but is closely related to the question of the Nation's schools and the education of our children.

The issue has often been misrepresented. It is even misnamed. It really concerns all the oil under the water, submerged lands surrounding the United States, not just tidelands.

Four States are staking claim to this oil. California, Louisiana, and Florida claim it within 3 miles of their shores, while Texas claims it within 3 leagues, or 10.5 miles. They are making other claims, too.

Geological surveys have indicated that there are at least 2.5 billion barrels in these areas. These surveys have further indicated that there are, at a bare minimum, 15 billion barrels of oil under the entire Continental Shelf surrounding the United States. This total of 15 billion barrels is more than one-fourth of the anticipated discoveries of oil for the entire Nation or 54 billion barrels.

Twice the Congress of the United States voted to turn over the greater portion of this wealth to the four States, but President Harry Truman vetoed the bills. In 1947 the United States Supreme Court ruled that all the people of the Nation owned the rich oil deposits. Just before leaving office, President Truman assigned these oil reserves to the Navy as a national defense measure, but the actual status of this action is being disputed.

Now the Congress is again being asked to legislate the greater portion of this wealth over to the four States. President Dwight D. Eisenhower is on record in favor of such action.

Just how much are these submerged oil lands actually worth? A probable average price for the oil over the next 20 years is $4.50 a barrel. The price of petroleum has been increasing at the rate of 7 percent annually. With the moderate estimate of 15 billion barrels, the gross income would total $67.5 billion. In addition, it is estimated that under the submerged lands there is natural gas valued at $10 billion. But for the time being, let us not consider this last figure, in order to compensate for the fact that some of the 15 billion barrels of oil may not be recovered. At 12½ percent, the royalties involved, not including gas, would total over $8.4 billion.

Of the major tidelands bills before Congress, the Anderson and Hill bills would spread these royalties throughout the United States on the basis of school populations. However, they would give the 4 coastal States 37½ percent of the royalties within their immediate areas. This would give the 4 coastal States $1.6 billion in royalties, and the other 44 States and the District of Columbia would receive $6.8 billion. The 4 States would receive $413 per enrolled school child and the rest of the United States $319.

But the majority of Congress does not favor the Anderson or Hill bills and at press time it seemed as if the Daniel bill has an excellent chance of passage. The Daniel "bonanza" would cede to the 4 coastal States all of the royalties of the immediate areas plus 37½ percent of the rest of the Continental Shelf. The residue would go into the Federal Treasury, presumably to be directed to all the States.

The Daniel fiasco would give the 4 coastal States $4.7 billion in royalties, and the other 44 States and the District of Columbia would share and divide $3.7 billion. The Daniel bill royalties are not earmarked for education, but if the funds were directed to that purpose, the 4 coastal States would receive $1,214 per enrolled school child while the rest of the United States would receive only $174—a 7-to-1 ratio.

Regardless of legislation the 4 coastal States, in addition, would receive benefits from some $8 billion in direct wages and business activity in the oil recovery. All told, 44 States and the District of Columbia will actually lose over $3 billion in funds specifically earmarked for educational purposes if the Daniel bill is passed.

You know, Mr. President, in this miasmic, wartorn world, there isn't much left that is tangible for youth except education. Please don't trade it for a couple of barrels of oil and some shortsighted Congressmen.

Yalta a Moral Issue—It Will Not Be Smothered by Political Neglect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 2, 1953

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a broadcast by that popular commentator, Mr. George E. Sokolsky.

Mr. Speaker, George Sokolsky in this broadcast refers to the Bohlen nomina-

Horace Heidt, world-famous band leader, has been devoting most of his time for the past 10 years to discovering and developing talented young people and giving them their big opportunity to express themselves in music, voice, and dancing.

He came to Washington recently to donate two scholarships to the American Field Service international scholarship committee yesterday. The scholarships were awarded to 17-year-old Monica Van Damme, of Nice, France, and 17-year-old Charles Mori, of Parma, Italy. They were especially chosen because of their interest in and study of music.

Horace Heidt's American Way radio program is broadcast over CBS Thursday nights at 10 p. m.

Here he provides young talent a chance to make their radio-network debut every Thursday night.

The presentation of the two scholarships, which took place in the Nation's capital, was made by Mrs. Edwin D. Graves, Jr., chairman of the District of Columbia Committee for the American Field Service. Other members of the local committee are Mrs. Arthur Krock, Mrs. William Fulbright, Mrs. Homer Ferguson, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Woods Bliss, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Bonner, Mrs. Raymond Cox, and Mrs. Richard B. Wigglesworth.

The American Field Service is a national organization. Mrs. Lawrence Tibbett is honorary chairman of the AFS international scholarships committee. Other members include Mrs. Margaret Biddle; Mme. Henri Bonnet; Louis Bromfield, who drove an AFS ambulance in World War I; Colgate W. Darden; Russell W. Davenport; Mark Ethridge; Mrs. Dorothy Canfield Fisher; Rt. Rev. A. B. Kinsolving II; Sumner Sewall; and Ellis Slater.

BACKGROUND ON THE AMERICAN FIELD SERVICE

The American Field Service was activated in 1915 as a volunteer ambulance corps serving the French armies. Between World War I and World War II, the organization brought a number of French graduate students to this country and financed the studies in Europe of a small number of American students.

Reactivated in 1939, the American Field Service served components of the British and French armies in the Middle East, India, North Africa, Italy, France, and the Low Countries.

With the war ended, the American Field Service embarked upon a program of sponsoring international scholarships at the high-school level. Supported solely in the beginning by private funds, the program got underway in 1947–48. Since then it has brought over 834 boys and girls, ages 16 to 18, from various European and Asiatic countries.

The children are chosen by special boards in their own countries and are selected on the basis of personality and intelligence. They must also have a knowledge of English.

The students attend an American high school for 1 year, during which time they live with an American family and participate in all community activities. At present, there are 235 students learning the American way of life in this manner.

Tidelands Oil Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 30, 1953

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of the so-called tidelands oil bill contended that the Congress had no power to override by legislation the decisions of the Supreme Court. Any lawyer recognizes the utter fallacy of this argument. Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States vests in the Congress "power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

As long as the decision of the Supreme Court remains unchanged, it is the law of the land and we must assume that the United States holds paramount rights in and to these lands, and, being Federal property, the Congress has power to dispose of them as it, in its discretion, deems judicious. In fact the Supreme Court itself has consistently held that this constitutional power of Congress is without limitation and that neither the courts nor the executive agencies could proceed contrary to an act of Congress in this congressional area of national power.

Acknowledging then that the Congress does have the power to override the decision of the Supreme Court, the question then is whether the Congress should exercise that power. To answer that question we must inquire into the realm of equity and fair play. We must begin by recognizing that the several States have from time immemorial considered these marginal lands to be their own property. In 1844, the Supreme Court, in the case of Pollard against Hagan, decided that—

> The shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them, were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively.

Since that case was decided, the Supreme Court has cited it with approval no less than 53 times, and State and Federal courts no less than 244 times.

It is argued by the opponents of the measure that none of these 53 Supreme Court decisions dealt specifically with marginal lands. Technically that is true. Nevertheless the language of the courts was such as to justify the States in believing that the courts felt that the lands beneath navigable waters in the marginal belt were embraced within its reasoning just as much as the soils beneath inland navigable waters.

Be that as it may, I am wholly unimpressed with whether the Supreme Court has previously had occasion to decide that the States owned these marginal lands or that the Court did not have such an occasion. To me, the proof of ownership goes deeper and is more fundamental.

As to the Thirteen Original Colonies, the original source of title came from grants of the Crown. In the case of our own State of Virginia, our first source of title and the first designation and delineation of our boundaries is found in the grant to Sir Walter Raleigh in the year 1584 as incorporated in the first charter of Virginia in 1606, the pertinent part of which reads as follows: "and that they shall have all the lands, woods, soil, grounds, havens, ports, rivers, mines, minerals, marshes, waters, fishings, commodities, and hereditaments, whatsoever, from the said first seat of their plantation and habitation by the space of 50 miles of English statute measure all along the said coast of Virginia and America as the coast lyeth, together with all the islands within 100 miles directly over against the same seacoast."

In the second charter of Virginia of 1609, the Crown confirmed the original grant and provided that the land should extend 200 miles north of Point Comfort and 200 miles south of Point Comfort, and further provided "together with all the soils, grounds, minerals," and so forth "within the said territories, and the precincts thereof, whatsoever, and thereto, and thereabouts both by sea," and I emphasize the word "sea," "and land, being or in any sort belonging or appertaining."

Further, in this second charter of 1609, the following language appears with reference to our mineral rights: "and we do also grant and confirm for us, our heirs and successors that it shall be lawful for the said treasurer and company and their successors by direction of the governors there to dig and to search for all manner of mines of gold, silver, copper, coal, tin, and all sorts of minerals within the precinct aforesaid." Thus it will be seen that the Commonwealth of Virginia was not only granted these marginal lands but specifically the minerals beneath the land as well.

In the third charter of Virginia which was granted in 1611 and 1612, title to the islands was again confirmed and the charter continued in the following language: "together with all and singular soils, lands, both within the said tract of land upon the main, and also within the said islands and seas adjoining whatsoever and thereunto or thereabouts, both by sea and land being or situate."

The claims of these Thirteen Original Colonies to these seaward lands and the minerals beneath these lands were recognized by other nations of the world. When the Thirteen Original Colonies announced their Declaration of Independence, England admitted and acknowledged in the treaty of 1783 that the several States owned the submerged lands seaward from their coast for a distance of 20 marine leagues. This seaward boundary was reflected upon the old maps of that day which are still preserved and may be examined today in the Library of Congress. When the Revolution took place, the people of each separate State became themselves a separate sovereign entity, and as such inherited the property rights of the Colonies.

But the opponents of the measure argued, without logic, I submit, that when the several States bound themselves together in a federation and joined in a common Constitution they thereby individually relinquished to the Union their title to the marginal lands. This

contention is wholly without legal justification. The 10th amendment of the Constitution provides:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution * * * are reserved to the States respectively.

Nowhere in the Constitution is there any language which would constitute a deed of conveyance to the Union.

To my mind, this series of events establishes a clear legal title, which title is protected by the constitutional provision against deprivation of property without due process of law. But even if this be classified as mere color of title, the States have used and occupied these lands openly and notoriously under claim of title for over 300 years and, if by no other method, are under law the fee simple owners by virtue of adverse possessions. Thus by ancient document, legal claim of title, equitable claim of title, and adverse use, the States have always been and are now the owners of these marginal lands. It is significant to note that the Federal Government never challenged this fact until oil was discovered.

One may ask, "But what does the Commonwealth of Virginia have to protect in these marginal lands?" Well, in Virginia's marginal belt, there are a total of 215,040 acres of submerged lands, and in the inland navigable waters there are, beneath the surface, a total of 586,240 acres of land. Moreover, if the decision in the California case is allowed to stand, the Federal Government will, according to a brief of the United States attorneys in that case, claim paramount rights in all of the filled and reclaimed lands along the beaches and all the bays wider than 10 miles, of which one is our own Cheasapeake Bay.

Furthermore, Virginia has sand and gravel resources in the marginal lands; she has piers and wharves which extend from the mainland to a point below the low-water mark and which, under the ruling in the California case, might now be standing on Federal ground. Still further, ownership of our valuable oyster beds is now uncertain and in jeopardy. But I say that even if Virginia never extracts one drop of oil from her marginal lands, or if she had not one oyster in her beds, or if she took not one grain of sand or gravel from these lands, she would still defend the principle involved. And more than that, she would defend the rights and resources of her sister States against the greedy encroachment of the Federal Government upon the domain of the sovereign States.

Opponents of the measure argued strenuously, and somewhat speciously I submit, that the Federal Government, through the Congress, was trying to "give away" all of the natural resources which, they said, belonged to all of the citizens of the United States. In the first place, you cannot give someone something which he already owns. In the second place, this bill grants to the United States of America 237,000 square miles of the outer Continental Shelf and to the individual States a total of only 23,000 square miles. This means that the United States retains nine-tenths of all of the Continental Shelf while the States get only one-tenth.

The opponents of the measure also advanced the argument that these resources should be retained by the Federal Government to be used as Federal aid to education. It was proven that all the revenues from submerged lands in the State of Texas have, for more than 30 years, been devoted to public education and in the other coastal States which have produced oil, a great portion of the revenue has been so used. What logic is there in the argument that the individual States should be deprived of this source of revenue for the education of their own children? Is it democratic to take much from the few to give little to the many?

But more important and as a practical matter, the Federal Government would never use these funds for that purpose anyway. Did you know that the Federal Government today owns 24 percent of all of the lands in the United States and not one cent of the revenue from these lands has ever been earmarked for educational purposes. This argument was only a smokescreen thrown up by the opposition to deceive the parents of the Nation and to confuse the proponents of the measure.

The contention was also made that the marginal oil resources should be retained by the Federal Government for national defense. This argument also is without merit. Regardless of which government owns or administers the land, oil and other necessary resources, they will always be available to our Nation for defense. In fact, the bill itself provides as follows:

> In time of war or when necessary for national defense, and the President or Congress shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase, at the prevailing market price, all or any portion of the said natural resources.

The truth of the matter is, that under State control and under State laws of conservation and depletion, more oil can be produced more economically than could be produced under Federal jurisdiction by an unwieldy, cumbersome, and wasteful Federal agency.

But friends, the real issue here involved is not monetary in nature. It is rather the fundamental issue of Federal dominion and control versus States rights and States sovereignty.

The Court, in the California case, by an ingenious process of devious and tortuous reasoning, pitched its decision upon the rationale that the rights and powers of the Federal Government transcend the rights of a mere property owner in the spheres of national defense and international relations. Because of its constitutional responsibility in these two spheres, it was said the Federal Government had paramount rights in these marginal lands; but the National Government has national defense powers over every foot of land in the Nation, and if this dangerous rationale is to be carried to its logical extreme, then the National Government under the guise of national defense would have the power to deprive without compensation the States and, yes, even private citizens of all of the minerals of whatever nature beneath the surface of their lands. Never before in history has any nation had such a strong judicial basis as these cases provide for nationalizing and socializing all of the natural resources of the country.

The citizens of the State of Virginia are opposed, unalterably opposed, to the ideology which fosters and attempts to justify such arbitrary action on the part of a federal government. In the ranks of those who either consciously or unwittingly are marching down the pink road to socialism, you will not find the unsullied flag of Virginia. Virginians realize that if our Government is to be truly of the people, by the people and for the people it must be kept close to the people, in our State capitols. Virginians recognize that in the concentration of ownership and power in Washington, D. C., there breeds the grains of autocracy—and autocracy is the stuff on which tyrants feed. Yes, more was at stake than land or oil or sand or oysters. The sanctity of private property rights and the lifeblood of our democracy was hanging in the balance.

I thank you.

SEC Blocks Capital Flow With Red Tape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1953

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jack Dudley, financial editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer, Sunday, March 22, 1953, entitled "SEC Blocks Capital Flow With Red Tape":

SEC BLOCKS CAPITAL FLOW WITH RED TAPE

The time has come to write a new set of rules for the securities business—rules that will encourage the free flow of capital into trade and industry rather than choke it off.

I don't know of any business that is more regulated or more cowed by fear of reprisals than the investment banking and brokerage field.

What's wrong with providing capital for business through the sale of securities? What's wrong with providing more jobs? And, finally, what's the matter with making a reasonable profit in the sale of securities? Our whole free-enterprise system is geared to the profit incentive.

The Securities and Exchange Commission sells itself to Congress and the public as the protector of the financial fortunes of the small investors. The truth of the matter is that many brokers, small investors in themselves, have gone out of business because they could not make a profit under SEC regulations. Before SEC came into being, there were 9,057 brokerage firms and offices in this country. The total last December was 7,065.

No wonder only 6 million Americans own stock. We cannot have greater distribution when we close the outlets.

Edward T. McCormick, president of the American Stock Exchange, could have been a little more definite when he said here last Thursday that the securities business was "lousy." Where you have SEC regulation, you have "lousy" business.

more apparent that we should resort to spiritual values as a foundation upon which lies our only hope in salvaging for our youth a guiding impulse for the building of tomorrow; and

Whereas by inculcating in our youth the lasting values that a faith and trust in a divine providence will serve as a guiding beam in steering our youth in building a character fit to cope with the problems of the future: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the House of Representatives of the 100th General Assembly of Ohio hereby deem that the interests of youth will be best served by implanting in them a sense of dependence on spiritual values as a guide of life and to that end hereby call upon the authorities of the schools of Ohio to invoke prayer as a part of each day's program; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives transmit a copy of this resolution to the superintendent of public instruction for promulgation among the schools of Ohio.

Why British Government Cut Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1953

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the British Information Services, an agency of the British Government, issued a release on April 20, 1953, headed "Tax Reduction: Why and How?" I quote from this report as follows:

The problem before the Chancellor in this budget was, therefore, to find ways of stimulating the economy to higher output and exports. Both fell in 1952, and there was consequently underemployment of Britain's resources even though there was little actual unemployment of manpower. The Chancellor decided that, in his own words, some "immediate quickener" was needed, some "shot in the arm" that would stimulate home demand where it had lagged behind availabilities, and provide a premium to industry to engage in large-scale expansion and modernization.

THE REAL PURPOSE

This, then, is the real purpose behind the tax reductions. For individuals there will be a little more money to spend, and a little reduction to purchase tax to bring prices within reach. For business, the cut in the general tax on profits (which is the same as income tax), the abolition of excess-profits tax after this year, and the reinstating of large tax allowances in the first year for new building and machinery, add up to a great incentive to management to plow their extra funds into the modernization of their businesses.

The Chancellor stressed these factors in his speech. The greatest hope for Britain lies in increasing the flexibility of the economy, so that wherever appropriate the Government should do less and the private citizen should do more." It will not be necessary, he said, "to save through the budget on anything like the scale of previous years." It will be enough to obtain a moderate surplus; and this will be possible, despite tax cuts, by the heightened activity that should yield an increase in the national income and indirectly in the buoyancy of revenue.

The new plans, reflecting a change in the world's economic climate, depend for success not only on a heightened incentive within Britain, but also on a willingness of labor and management to keep wages and profits stable, so that Britain's export drive is not frustrated through increased costs. The Chancellor said he was sure that industry and the public would respond to the call. He concluded his speech with these words:

"In this spirit we take a new direction. We step out from the confines of restriction to the almost forgotten but beckoning prospects of freer endeavor and greater reward for effort."

Letters From President Eisenhower and President Bidault, of France, Sending Greetings to the Members of the Rochambeau Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 24, 1953

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD messages received on Thursday, April 16, when representatives from the Rochambeau States met at Mount Vernon, and unanimously elected Mr. Charles Parmer, of Virginia, the permanent chairman of the Joint Rochambeau Road Committee.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C.

MR. CHARLES PARMER,
Alexandria, Va.:

I am happy to send greetings to the representatives of the Rochambeau States—those States through which passed the 4,000 French troops led by Lieutenant General Rochambeau as they marched to Yorktown to join our forces in 1781. In planning the uniform marking of their victory route, you are once again acknowledging the important role which France played in securing the independence of our Nation.

I join you in this tribute to the people of France, our allies in 1781, our friends today.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

PARIS, FRANCE.—I am happy to greet the members of the Rochambeau Commission as well as the representatives of the States through which Rochambeau marched, from Narragansett Bay to Yorktown, and to congratulate more particularly Gov. John S. Battle, founder of the Commission, and Mr. Charles Parmer, its chairman.

It was a thoughtful initiative indeed when you decided to uniformly mark the route which Rochambeau and his soldiers took in 1781. In so doing, you are stressing upon your countrymen the fact that France is the oldest friend and ally of the United States. In a similar manner the Voie de la Liberté (Liberty Highway), which runs through France—from Normandy to Alsace—and the cemeteries along its trail remind the French citizens of the young Americans who, during the two world wars, shed their blood on the French soil.

Today, as in 1781, in 1917 and in 1944, our two countries stand united for the defense of liberty.

I convey to you my most cordial and sincere wishes for the success of your plans.

GEORGES BIDAULT,
Ministre des Affaires Étrangères.

Looting of National Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 24, 1953

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the New York Times of Tuesday, April 21, contained in its Letters to the Editor column a very fine letter on the offshore oil controversy. The letter was written by my old friend, Mr. Maurice P. Davidson, of New York City, an outstanding engineer and attorney. I was privileged to appoint Mr. Davidson to the New York Power Authority when I was Governor. His letter is a useful contribution to our thinking on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOTING OF NATIONAL ASSETS—FEAR OF AN AVALANCHE OF GIVEAWAY LEGISLATION IS EXPRESSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The United States is a great country, and we rarely do things by halves. Certainly the proponents of the program to give away our national resources are moving on a grand scale. A complete pattern for transferring to private ownership our national heritage of oil, gas, minerals, and publicly owned power resources is now emerging into full view.

Former President Herbert Hoover is urging that the United States leave the public-power field. He proposes that the Federal Government cease producing electricity from water power as soon as possible. The goal of his efforts is to turn over to private interests all the beneficial rights of the people of the United States in the public water-power resources of the Nation. At the diamond jubilee convocation of the Case Institute of Technology Mr. Hoover outlined three first steps toward the goal of transferring Federal power facilities to private or local management.

PENDING BILLS

The tidelands oil bills now before Congress, which seem to be slated for passage, would in effect turn over for private ownership and exploitation all the federally owned resources in oil and gas contained in the tidelands which extend from 3 to 10 miles seaward from low-water mark; and also the oil and gas resources in the Continental Shelf, which extends as far as 150 miles beyond the claimed States' boundaries. These bills are being lobbied through Congress by the great oil interests. The value of these gas and oil reserves is estimated at from forty to one hundred and fifty billion dollars. This is generally regarded as a convervative estimate. Informed opinion says that the real value cannot be measured. It may run into trillions.

Not satisfied with these expected accomplishments, some of the proponents of the giveaway program, according to statements made by United States Senators BUTLER and HUNT, intend to introduce legislation to turn over to the States for private exploitation the mineral resources of the United States in the 700 million acres of public lands. If this program goes through, the patrimony of the United States will be dissipated. In fact, there will be nothing left to give away except the forests in our national parks and the fruits of our investments in atomic energy.

If these calamities should overtake us it will be due either to the uninformed public or to default and apathy on their part. Vigilance is the price of liberty and the preservation of our democratic institutions, but vigilance seems to be lacking in this crisis, when the most callous and astounding plans are in the making to give away practically all our national assets.

SUPREME COURT DECISION

This gigantic giveaway scheme is highlighted by one of the provisions of the Holland bill, Senate Joint Resolution 13, one of the tidelands bills now up for debate in Congress. It provides that in time of war or national emergency the Federal Government shall have the right of first refusal to purchase the gas and oil now owned by the United States from the transferees thereof at the then prevailing market prices. This giveaway legislation is being pressed in the face of seven decisions of the United States Supreme Court holding that the United States of America holds sovereign rights of ownership in the oil and gas reserves in the tidelands and in the Continental Shelf.

It seems clear that the enactment of the tidelands oil bills into law will dislodge a giveaway avalanche of new legislation to carry out the pattern outlined herein.

What are we going to do about it? Are these to be the fruits of a new administration which rode into power on a crusade to protect the people? We face an attempt at the largest looting in history of national assets.

MAURICE P. DAVIDSON,
Former Member of New York State Power Authority.

NEW YORK, *April 17, 1953.*

Views on Balanced Budget and Tax Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 1953

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks a copy of the Legislative Daily of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, as follows:

BALANCED BUDGET OR TAX CUTS?—WE CAN HAVE BOTH

The biggest debate in Washington today is over which should come first, tax cuts or a clear path to a balanced budget.

The public is following this debate closely, if not always clearly.

There is strong sentiment for tax reduction.

The workingman's wife cannot buy clothes for the children or furnishings for the home with money which her husband must pay in taxes.

The farmer cannot replace his equipment with money to which the tax collector lays claim.

A business cannot grow normally when the earnings which it would plow back are sharply reduced after present corporate taxes have been met.

Savings siphoned off by taxes cannot be employed in the private investment that is essential to expanding employment and production.

Yes—there is strong sentiment for tax cuts.

But there is strong desire, too, for elimination of unnecessary or postponable Federal spending—elimination that is indispensable to balancing the national budget while maintaining a strong national defense.

That desire is directly linked with the sentiment for tax cuts, because today's tax rates have driven home the close relationship between spending and taxing.

That became clear last November to those political office seekers who did not realize it before.

Deficit financing is no longer just a term in an economics textbook. There is growing awareness that when the Government must borrow annually to cover the differences between its income and spending, the dollar is not as strong as it could be—will not buy as much.

And America has always preferred the strong dollar.

So the demand grows for tax cuts and spending reductions without impairment to defense—and the debate continues over which should come first.

Couldn't they come together?

CHAMBER'S POSITION

The national chamber believes they could and should.

It is possible both to balance the Nation's budget and to reduce personal income taxes by midyear—and those two actions should go hand in hand. That position is based on recent emergency action by the national chamber's board of directors.

Meanwhile, other tax reductions which are scheduled for this year and early next year can become effective as planned.

Much of the responsibility for budget cutting, to which tax cuts are linked, will rest with Congress, which has exclusive control over appropriations.

But to do its job, Congress will need strong public support. Pressure on individual Members of Congress for increased spending on pet projects will have to be carefully avoided. And there will have to be firm opposition to proposals, which arise from time to time within Congress, to increase spending on programs and projects which cannot be considered essential under present emergency conditions.

TWO OPINIONS

In connection with the debate in and out of Congress over tax cuts versus spending cuts, it is important to note that those on either side of the argument favor both tax and spending reductions and differ only on priority.

Those who believe budget cutting should come first argue that the administration first must determine at what levels spending can be held before it can decide how much revenue will be needed. They say discipline is involved here, too. Give a free-spending Member of Congress a tax cut first, they contend, and he quickly will lose his interest in budget balancing; better hold back the tax cut as his later reward for economy efforts.

Those who want tax reductions first argue that lower revenues will force increased Government economy. They also contend that some tax rates can reach and, in fact, some have reached, points of diminishing returns—producing less revenue than somewhat lower rates would because they tend to curb incentive to earn taxable income.

MIDDLE GROUND

There is noted, meanwhile, a middle ground on which tax and budget cutting can move abreast.

"The ideal procedure is to have the two move along together," the National City Bank of New York observes in its March 1953 letter. "Some individuals may feel it is necessary to keep the pressure on reducing expenditures by not letting tax reductions go ahead too fast. Others may feel that by demanding tax reduction they are bringing pressure for reduction in expenditures. Apart, however, from the disadvantages * * * of treating the two problems independently, there is the risk of getting people lined up in opposing camps when essentially they are working for the same end."

In the meantime, today's tax picture contains sharp political coloring.

The so-called excess profits tax, which was imposed after fighting began in Korea, is due to expire June 30. The 11 percent individual income tax increase, also voted after the Korean fighting broke out, is due to expire December 31. There is strong support within Congress for letting the 11 percent increase end June 30, too. Those who oppose this idea are told by its advocates that to let the excess profits tax expire without ending the individual income tax increase at the same time would not be politically popular.

CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS

That vision of diminished political popularity is not lost on the Republican leaders of Congress, who are holding out against making immediate commitments to move up the expiration date of the individual income tax increase. But they do want to give the new administration more time to try to boil down the budget for the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, which it took over from the previous administration.

Mr. Truman was required by law to submit a fiscal 1954 budget within 15 days after Congress convened January 3. President Eisenhower, who took office January 20, has had to work with the Truman budget instead of starting from scratch on one of his own. His fiscal advisers have agreed to send Congress their revisions of the Truman budget by May 1.

The President says he wants a decision on reduced revenues reserved until a balanced budget is in sight. Congressional leaders expect to know by May 1 whether it will be sufficiently in sight for them to agree to the earlier expiration of the personal income tax increase and other scheduled tax rate declines.

TAX SCHEDULE

In addition to the individual income and excess profits taxes, these rates are affected by the present schedule:

On December 31, withholding rates are to decline from 20 to 18 percent and the maximum capital gains rates for individuals is to drop from 26 to 25 percent, with corporations receiving the same reduction a year later.

Excise taxes on many items are to revert to previous lower levels April 1, 1954.

The corporate income tax rate is to decline from 52 to 47 percent March 31, 1954, with appropriate adjustments for fiscal year corporations.

The national chamber believes all of those reductions should become effective as scheduled.

TAX LOAD

There is widespread agreement that taxes are too high—the burden they impose, too heavy.

How big is today's tax burden?

Federal, State, and local tax collections this year will equal about 30 percent of the national income.

They will total about $90 billion—the equivalent of all the wages, salaries, rent, interest, and dividends received by all the people of this country from January 1 through April 22 of this year.

Present tax rates are curbing incentive, production, investment—all essential to a strong economy.

High tax rates can be, and in some cases are, self-defeating, whereas lower rates may have a stimulating effect that will bring in more revenue.

Certainly any additional revenue could be used.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

And so could the economic stimulation. A number of economists have expressed concern over the possibility of some economic

assimilate and amalgamate in the melting pot that is America.

Like others, I sometimes fear that we have already gone beyond the possibility of continuing America as a melting pot, but rather that we are approaching that day when we will find demands made upon our country for the allocation of certain areas to certain national groups. Have we forgotten the experience of Czechoslovakia with the Sudetenland? There are today some in our midst who care not to Americanize themselves, but rather feel that they as national groups should have a right to possess for themselves certain areas of America.

And still strange ideas present themselves. Only a few days ago a high official of the Christian Science Church told me that he and his group had just awakened to the sinister possibilities of the so-called World Health Organization, that could jeopardize the rights of American citizens.

The United Nations should abandon its attempts to control domestic rights all over the world and should bend its efforts to the objectives and ambitions of those who brought it into being. It should be an instrument for the preservation of peace in the world.

Strange idea, indeed, that there is no obligation upon the new arrivals at our gates to learn and speak our national language. Why English? is the question I heard sometime ago. Many are there who would prefer to establish another in its place. Unless an immigrant is willing to become Americanized, he should not be admitted for permanent residence. We should have no pseudo-Americans as citizens.

Strange idea that America should leave unmolested in our midst those communistic adherents who would undermine our institutions. I believe that every Communist subservient to a foreign power should be manacled like a mad dog and deprived of an opportunity of proving his treachery.

The hearings of our Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in New York last fall disclosed Communists in our midst, acting in the name of America. I repeat now what I said then—the United Nations should purge itself or be purged. But how can that take place with so many Communist partners blocking every move for the common international good? We must find a way to meet that menace.

Let us ever remember that we ourselves must guard our own liberties, and by so doing we will promote the peace of the world.

Then, too, let us not forget those words of 50 years ago of that great American poet, Thomas Bailey Aldrich, in his poem "Unguarded Gates":

"Wide open and unguarded stand our gates,
And through them presses a wild motley throng—
O Liberty, white Goddess; is it well
To leave the gates unguarded? On thy breast
Fold Sorrow's children, soothe the hurts of fate,
Lift the downtrodden, but with hand of steel
Stay those who to thy sacred portals come
To waste the gifts of freedom. Have a care
Lest from thy brow the clustered stars be torn
And trampled in the dust. For so of old
The thronging Goth and Vandal trampled Rome,
And where the temples of the Caesars stood
The lean wolf unmolested made her lair."

May we remember those words, with the determination ever in our hearts, that we will never abandon our concepts of individual and national liberty, and that we will allow no foreign ism to impair its integrity.

And may we continue our prayer, "God bless America."

Offshore Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 25, 1953

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a copy of a letter addressed by him to the Secretary of State and the State Department's reply thereto.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1953.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
The Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There have recently been submitted to you for official report to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee four proposed measures for enactment into law relating to the control and development of the mineral resources of the lands submerged by the open ocean adjacent to the shores of the United States. One of these measures is Senate bill 294, another copy of which is attached hereto for your convenient reference.

This proposed legislation would provide, among other things, that title to and ownership of lands submerged by the open ocean for a distance of 3 miles out to sea would be recognized and confirmed in the individual coastal States. You will recall that the Supreme Court of our Nation, which, under the Constitution, is the final judge of land titles, has in three separate cases ruled unequivocally that the individual States do not, and never did, own the lands beneath the ocean, but that the Federal Government, by virtue of its responsibility for the external affairs of our Nation, had paramount rights in them (332 U. S. 19; 339 U. S. 699; 339 U. S. 707).

However, putting aside for the moment the constitutionality and propriety of Congress attempting to reverse the Supreme Court in a matter of land titles and to rewrite our history, as well as to arrogate to individual States its responsibility for external affairs, I would like to point out to you, as the executive officer of the United States directly in charge of our external affairs, that in addition to providing for State ownership of submerged ocean lands within the historic seaward boundaries of coastal States, Senate bill 294 would also authorize the de facto extension of State boundaries out to the outermost edge of the Continental Shelf, a distance of upward to 200 miles or so, in some instances.

I am informed that the United States Government, beginning with Mr. Thomas Jefferson's letter to the British Minister, dated November 8, 1793 (1 Moore, Digest of International Law, 702), has had frequent occasion to express its views as to the appropriate seaward extension of the territory and jurisdiction of the United States. Some of these expressions are collected in the digests of international law published by Moore (1906) and Hackworth (1940). I am also advised that on November 13, 1951, the Acting Secretary of State wrote to the Attorney General in regard to the traditional position of the United States with respect to the measurement of territorial waters.

In the light of these expressions and of the provisions of S. 294 discussed in the preceding paragraphs, I should appreciate a statement of your views with respect to the following matters:

1. To what extent would recognition of the seaward boundary of a coastal State at a point more than 3 geographical miles from the shores of this country or from the seaward limits of inland waters, constitute a departure from the established, historic position of the United States with respect to the outer limits of the territorial waters of the United States?

2. Assuming that the proposed grant to the respective coastal States of police, taxation, and other jurisdictional powers with respect to the Continental Shelf beyond State boundaries would vest in each such State the right to exercise those powers over persons other than its own citizens (cf. *Skiriotes* v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 69)), to what extent would the granting of such jurisdiction constitute a conflict with or departure from the established, historic position of the United States with respect to the exercise of jurisdictional powers on the high seas beyond the territorial limits of the United States?

3. To what extent would the proposed legislation conflict, not only with the exclusive constitutional rights the Federal Government has over the area within and beyond the 3-mile limit, but also with the obligations and responsibilities that the Federal Government has by reason of international law, treaty, custom, and usage? Are there any treaties, etc., that might be violated?

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
United States Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 6, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Reference is made to your letter of February 12, 1953, the receipt of which was acknowledged February 20, 1953, referring to bills introduced in the Senate for the control and development of mineral resources of submerged lands off the shores of the United States and raising certain questions regarding the traditional position of the United States with respect to national claims in adjacent seas.

The first question is to what extent would recognition of the seaward boundary of a State at a point more than 3 miles from the shores of this country constitute a departure from the traditional position of the United States with respect to the outer limit of its territorial waters.

This Nation has always supported the concept that the sovereignty of coastal States in seas adjacent to their coasts (as well as the lands beneath such waters and the airspace above them) is limited to a belt of 3 miles width, and has vigorously objected to claims of other States to broader limits. In international relations the territorial claims of the States and of the Nation are indivisible. This Nation now supports the 3-mile limit, and the claims of the States cannot exceed those of the Nation. But if the Nation should recognize the extension of the boundaries of any State beyond the 3-mile limit, its identification with the broader claim would, perforce, supersede in its international relations its previous and traditional position.

The second question is to what extent would the granting to the States of police, taxation ,and other jurisdictional powers over persons other than their own citizens (cf. *Skiriotes* v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 69)) conflict with the historic position of the United States with respect to the exercise of jurisdictional powers on the high seas beyond the limit of its territorial waters.

This Nation has traditionally taken the position that it was not prevented by international law from reasonably exercising its jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile limit for certain purposes. Legislation is now in effect

whereby this Government exercises jurisdiction over foreign as well as domestic vessels for purposes of customs control (Anti-smuggling Act of August 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 517, 19 U. S. C. 1701–1711)). This exercise of jurisdiction is recognized in international practice. Exercises of jurisdiction in the high seas for fiscal, sanitation, or navigation purposes are not infrequent. The claim made by the United States in the Presidential proclamation of September 20, 1945, to jurisdiction and control of the national resources of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf off its coast was without precedent. In keeping with its traditional position, however, this Government carefully refrained from suggesting that it was claiming sovereignty, or an extension of its territorial waters or boundaries, and indeed specified in the proclamation that the character as high seas of the waters above the Continental Shelf and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation were in no way affected. Hence a grant of jurisdictional powers to the States, in order to be consistent with the traditional position of this Nation, would have to be restricted to the purposes indicated above.

The third and last question is to what extent would the proposed legislation conflict with the obligations and responsibilities of the Federal Government under international law, treaty, and usage. Extension of the boundary of a State beyond the 3-mile limit would directly conflict with international law, as the United States conceives it, and may, moreover, precipitate developments in international practice to which this Government, in the national interest, is clearly opposed. A number of foreign States are at present showing a clear propensity to extend their sovereignty over considerable areas of their adjacent seas. This restricts the freedom of the sea, and the freedom of the sea has been and is a cornerstone of the United States policy because it is a maritime and naval power. Any change of position regarding the 3-mile limit on the part of the United States is likely to be seized upon by other states as justification or excuse for broader and even extravagant claims over their adjacent seas. Indeed, this is just what happened when this Government made its proclamation of 1945 regarding the resources of the Continental Shelf. It precipitated a chain reaction of claims generally going beyond the terms of the United States proclamation, including claims of sovereignty extending to 200 miles from shore. Extension now of the jurisdictional powers of the States in the high seas beyond those heretofore claimed by the Nation would, of course, be an abandonment of the traditional policy of the United States and negate the determined efforts now being made by this Government to oppose and restrain such actions on the part of others. It would likewise be an abandonment of those States which have hitherto stood with us in the development of our present position.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Repeal of Excise and Admissions Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1953

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the RECORD shows, for some time, in offering amendments to our tax laws, I have stressed the fact that what we ought to concern ourselves with, first, is the ironing out of inequities in our present tax structure, and the plugging up of loopholes resulting in inequities, unfairnesses, and tax escapes on the part of certain groups and certain types of businesses.

Some years ago—I think as early as 1947—I urged a drastic revision of the excise taxes, because I felt that many of them were unfair, many were very discriminatory, and many were generally not based upon ability to pay. At that time I suggested that there should be a substantial reduction in the admission tax.

Reserving the right to change my opinion, on the basis of evidence and argument that may be advanced in the course of debate, my present thinking is that we ought to get rid of theater admission and excise taxes, if not entirely, then substantially, because I believe the theaters of the country are being subjected to a very discriminatory tax that is working a great hardship on them, in view of the increasing public appeal and competition of television.

Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. Jack Matlack, spokesman for the Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., in the State of Oregon. Attached to his letter is a memorandum of arguments, one page being entitled "War Tax? Defense Tax? Luxury Tax? What Kind of Tax Is It?"

The next page is labeled "Discriminatory Tax."

The next page is headed "Theater Business Is 'Small' Business."

The next page is headed "Economic Urgency."

The last page is entitled "Motion Picture Theater As an Institution of Public Service."

I believe that the memorandums are so meritorious in their contents and so deserving of consideration by my colleagues in the Senate, and particularly by the committee which has jurisdiction over tax reform and tax measures, that I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and the memorandums printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNCIL OF MOTION PICTURE
ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
Portland, Oreg., April 16, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the 220 motion-picture theater owners and operators in the State of Oregon, I wish to thank you for the audience you gave to their representatives and me at the Roosevelt Hotel in Portland recently.

You asked then that I send you some pertinent information regarding the reasons we seek your support in the Senate to effect the repeal, in its entirety, of the Federal admission tax law levied on theater admissions.

This legislation will reach the floor of the Congress shortly. The precarious condition of the theater owner today prompts us urgently to beseech you to press our claim that we be relieved of this oppressive and unfair tax, the burden of which may shortly put many of us out of business entirely. We must become militant and jealous of our rights as businessmen and demand equal consideration instead of a luxury classification. The time has passed when we can pay more than any other business for the right to do business.

As per your request, I am attaching hereto a summary of the arguments which we feel justify our contentions. We earnestly hope that you will see the justice of our plea and will give us your support as well as your vote when this matter reaches the floor.

Most respectfully yours,

JACK MATLACK
(For Oregon theater owners).

WAR TAX?—DEFENSE TAX?—LUXURY TAX?—WHAT KIND OF TAX IS IT?

Originally levied as a defense tax at 10 percent, later increased to 20 percent during the war, this burden still rests on the shoulders of the theater owner long after the emergency has passed, and should be eliminated along with the relief being granted other types of business.

Certainly, as entertainment, a theater admission should not be subject to an excise tax any more than radio or television, grand opera or symphony; as a service industry, why any more than a shoeshining parlor, a laundry, or a parking lot? Motion-picture entertainment is not a luxury. On the contrary, it affords low-priced amusement for the masses of low- and middle-income groups who, caught in the tide of rising prices, cannot afford the more expensive forms of relaxation. For many people it is the only entertainment they can afford, although we grant it might be considered a luxury to the harassed housewife who can send her children to a movie on Saturday or Sunday for 3 hours or more, where they can be cared for at approximately 6 cents an hour.

DISCRIMINATORY TAX

First, because it makes the industry a tax collector for the Government. Second, the theater must compete as a business with bowling alleys, golf courses, billiard parlors, etc., all of which are tax free. Third, this is actually a "soak the poor" tax. It is discriminatory against the public, particularly the low- and middle-income groups, to which movies provide the cheapest and most available form of entertainment. Wealthy citizens who can afford to spend huge amounts for entertainment can avoid tax completely. They can go to the opera, concerts, or symphony orchestras, all much more costly than the movies, without tax. People can watch television at home, at the neighbor's, in taverns, or in free TV theaters without paying a tax, yet television is currently the motion-picture industry's strongest competition, a threat to its very life. A rich man can hire a fishing boat for a day for $60, buy a caterer's lunch for $20, and not pay a cent in Federal tax for his amusement. This country is supposed to be operating on the theory that taxation is based upon the ability to pay. It does not look like this when it comes to the theater business.

THEATER BUSINESS IS SMALL BUSINESS

Of the nearly 20,000 theaters in the United States, some fifteen thousand-odd are small businesses and individually owned, not affiliated with any large circuit or chain usually designated as big business. Of the some 200 theaters served out of the Portland territory more than 90 percent are individually owned and should be classified as small business.

In the President's recent state of the Union message to Congress, while proclaiming that it was not Government policy to reduce taxes largely this year, he did indicate his intention to give help to small businesses which were in need of relief from tax burdens. Certainly the removal of the admission tax would effect this help without

FOREIGN NATIONS' EFFECT

The foreign nations get into the picture through their recent heavy purchases of gold from the Federal Treasury. Their improving trade positions have made it possible for them to pile up dollars in United States banks. Since last November, they've used $776 million of these balances to buy gold. Here's how this, too, squeezes the United States banks' reserves:

The foreign nation pays the Treasury for the gold with a check on its United States bank. The Treasury deposits the check in a Federal Reserve bank, which reduces the reserve account of the foreign nation's bank by the amount of the check.

All this has forced the banks to scramble around for reserves. These they can acquire chiefly in two ways:

They can sell their own Government securities to raise cash to place in their reserve accounts. This isn't as risk-free as it was before March 1951, when the Reserve System stopped supporting Government securities prices at fixed levels, but it's being done—and in a big way.

J. P. MORGAN VIEW

Another method of raising cash is to borrow from the Reserve System. "In many cases," says Henry C. Alexander, president of J. P. Morgan & Co., banks have been "obliged to obtain the necessary funds by borrowing from the Federal Reserve more frequently and heavily than ever before."

The New York banks, with the exception of a few 2- or 3-day periods, have been continuously in debt to the System for the past 6 months.

At the end of last week, the major New York institutions owed the System about $225 million—just enough to boost their reserves $30 million above the required minimum. A year earlier, their reserves had been nearly $300 million in the black.

Where the Onus Lies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1953

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where the Onus Lies," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Wednesday, April 22, 1953.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THE ONUS LIES

Who is responsible for the delay on rent control and other pressing legislation in the Senate—Majority Leader TAFT or the Senators opposed to the offshore-oil giveaway?

Senator TAFT says the onus is on the minority of Senators who are fighting the quitclaim bill to turn over these vast resources to three States: California, Texas, and Louisiana. He says these Senators are filibustering and that he, therefore, is getting ready to invoke a cloture limitation to shut off debate. He has already invoked night sessions.

A few basic facts show readily enough who is at fault:

First, the Senate is debating the bewhiskered offshore-oil issue at this time only because the TAFT leadership has accorded the giveaway bill this high priority. The Senators opposed to it cannot choose the time of their debate. They must register opposition when the bill is up. If the administration's economic controls legislation languishes and rent control dies, April 30, it will be because TAFT is using this strategy in order to force passage of the rape of the coastal oil reserves.

Second, the Senators who are fighting the oil giveaway and all that it entails are not only willing but eager to halt their presentation of the people's case at any moment to enable Senator TAFT to bring up the controls bill and all other pressing legislation. When 20 Senators so notified TAFT in a joint letter, the majority leader retorted: "I don't care whether rent control expires or not."

Third, a thorough presentation of the case against State exploitation of the American people's own resources is required to inform the people themselves. The oil lobby has been at work for about 10 years on a costly, skillful campaign in Congress and out. The Senators who are opposed to the giveaway would be untrue to their own conscience if they did not now explain in detail to the country how this legislation involves defense, security, inland natural resources, Federal-State relations, foreign affairs, treaty provisions and other vital matters.

Fourth, the official position of the Eisenhower administration, as set forth by Attorney General Brownell and others from the executive department, does not square with the terms of the oil Senators' giveaway. Twenty-five other Senators, more than a fourth of the total membership—including to their credit, Republicans TOBEY, of New Hampshire, and LANGER, of North Dakota—have joined in a letter to President Eisenhower calling his attention to this conflict.

Every minute taken by the opponents of the giveaway has been on the subject. No one is reading the Bible, the Sears, Roebuck catalogue, or the Encyclopedia Britannica. What Washington is seeing this month is a heroic effort to awake the American people to the impending gold rush, to the Senator DOUGLAS's accurate description, into the people's own priceless, natural heritage.

Every day this fight continues produces more and more support from grassroots for the Hill-Humphrey-Lehman-Douglas-Anderson-Fulbright-Kefauver-Morse group of Senators.

Every hour of the wearing night sessions increases the chance that Dwight D. Eisenhower will come to see where his duty lies as President of all the people.

President Eisenhower has already straightened himself out on taxes. After loose campaign talk about cutting taxes he is now standing firm for a balanced budget. Let him now rise above the campaign confusion over offshore oil, inform himself on the full facts and then follow his own true conscience without pressure from the oil Senators. If he does so there is little doubt as to what his final stand would be.

No, the blame for the situation in the Senate does not lie on the 25 Senators. Their conduct up to this moment is unassailable. The onus is squarely on the majority leadership.

A Matter of Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1953

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Matter of Sovereignty," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sunday, April 19, 1953.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MATTER OF SOVEREIGNTY

One of the most momentous decisions in the history of the country may be made by the Senate in the coming week.

It is the decision whether the belt of seas bordering the continental United States is subject to National sovereignty or State ownership.

The immediate legislation on which the decision will rest is Senate Joint Resolution 13. It would give California, Texas, and Louisiana the oil and natural gas in the bed of the seas off their coasts out to the distance which they regard as their historic boundaries seaward.

The House has already passed the measure. President Eisenhower has announced that he will sign it. A majority of the Senate is evidently ready to vote for it. A small group of Senators, led by DOUGLAS, of Illinois, LEHMAN, of New York, and HILL, of Alabama, and including HENNINGS and SYMINGTON, of Missouri, as well as two Republicans, TOBEY, of New Hampshire, and LANGER, of North Dakota, are holding the thin line of defense. They hope the arguments they are advancing will persuade enough Senators to defeat the resolution, or will persuade the President to veto it.

It is a small hope, but the only remaining one. In 1946 and again in 1952 President Truman stood single-handed against the intended plunder of the national domain, saving it with the Presidential veto.

There are many cogent reasons why the United States should not surrender any part of its national sovereignty to any one of the 48 States, as it would do in this resolution.

The area involved is one of the most delicate international diplomacy, in which the peace of the world may at any moment hang in the balance. This is a governing reason why the Supreme Court has thrice decided, in cases covering all the claimants to offshore oil, that the United States exercises and must continue to exercise sovereignty over this resource as well as all other resources of the seabelt. "The problems of commerce, national defense, relations with other powers, war and peace focus there," said the Court. "National rights must therefore be paramount."

The oil in the marginal seas—the 3-mile belt out from low-tide mark—and in the Continental Shelf—the submerged skirt of the continent where the waters are relatively shallow before plunging into the abysses of the sea—is necessary for national defense.

These undersea fields must be developed by private initiative under Federal control. When they have been drained down to what should be their reserves for national defense, someone must have the will and the authority to put the lid on. The States cannot be expected to do this; they bear no responsibility for national defense—that responsibility is the Government's.

If the reserves were dangerously depleted under State ownership, the United States might be compelled to expend much blood and treasure to keep open or reopen lines of supply from the Middle East or elsewhere, for oil which could, by the exercise of foresight, have been kept available within easy reach of our own shores.

There are grave doubts that the proposed giveaway would be constitutional. Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, and former Solicitor General Perlman doubt the constitutionality of the measure. Attorney General Brownell has implied doubt on the same constitutional point by trying to avoid collision

with it. The Supreme Court's own words in the California case, reaffirmed in the Texas and Louisiana cases, appear to support the conception that offshore oil is an adjunct of national sovereignty and that Congress, therefore, is powerless to give it away. The Rhode Island Legislature has directed the attorney general of that State to contest the resolution if it is enacted.

Adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 13, accordingly, might paralyze the development of the undersea oil lands indefinitely. Existing and possible future efforts of States to extend their boundaries farther seaward could also provide additional fruitful fields for prolonged litigation. The proponents of giving the oil to the States have argued long and loudly that it is the most expeditious way of getting the fields developed. The exact opposite proves to be the case.

In a nation struggling to make financial ends meet under a crushing burden of national defense, giving away an estimated $80 billion or more of national assets does not make sense. To Missouri alone, its share of the national assets involved amounts to the equivalent of at least a $1¼-billion endowment for the State's public schools.

Giving away offshore oil would be only the opening move to a giveaway of the minerals in public lands and the grasses of the western range—involving a grand total of more than a trillion dollars. No wonder Perlman called the offshore-oil bill the largest wholesale looting in history of national assets.

If the United States recognized Texas and Louisiana claims to 10½ miles seaward, it would be embarrassed in its efforts to preserve the international convention of a 3-mile limit. Other nations might retaliate with extensions of their boundaries seaward such as would endanger the freedom of the seas, as the State Department has warned.

American States would be invited by the terms of the pending resolution to extend their borders seaward to the limits of their imaginations. Texas has extended its claim in advance to 150 miles. Senator CORDON, of Oregon, floor leader for the resolution, has admitted that no one knows where the coastal boundaries of the States were when they were admitted into the Union.

There is no foreseeable end to the dispute which this resolution would open up between States and the Federal Government over the contents of the seabed. An estimated $3 billion worth of sulfur is know to exist in addition to the oil and natural gas. Still other valuable national assets as yet unknown may be present. As the Supreme Court said: "Today the controversy is over oil. Tomorrow it may be over some other substance or perhaps the bed of the ocean itself."

The Post-Dispatch has been in the battle over offshore oil since it began in earnest 8 years ago. We said on October 17, 1945, that "against any effort to use our fighting oil to any smaller purpose than the defense of our Nation, the only course is to fight." Nothing has happened in the world to lend that intention less urgency in the intervening years, and much has happened to lend it more.

The President ought to give studious and serious consideration to the accumulation of logic which speaks against this measure. He should not consider himself bound to error by opinions expressed when by his own admission he knew little of either the facts or the law. He cannot want to give the color of his signature to a quid pro quo of oil for votes in Texas and California, which cast their electoral ballots for him, and in Louisiana, a traditionally Democratic State which he narrowly lost to Governor Stevenson.

It is a decision of the gravest moment for the Senate, and for the President, as for the Nation.

The Sturdy Corporate Homesteader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 25, 1953

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there will appear in the May issue of Harper's magazine an article entitled "The Sturdy Corporate Homesteader," written by Bernard DeVoto. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] left the article with me and asked me to have it inserted in the RECORD, which I agreed to do. He assured me that he had permission to have the article inserted in the RECORD. It is a wonderful article. It is written by one of the most effective, courageous battlers for the conservation of our natural resources, and one of the most able journalists in our country, the great Bernard DeVoto, who has written over the years many articles on the problem of preserving, protecting, and conserving for future generations of America its great rich treasure and heritage of all our people in our natural resources.

As Senators know, he writes monthly in the section of Harper's called "The Easy Chair." The article to be published in the May number is very stimulating. The spirit of it is so in line with the conservation objectives of the little band of liberals in the Senate who have been fighting for weeks in opposition to what we consider to be a very unsound and unwise giveaway program with respect to a very valuable segment of our natural resources that I think it particularly appropriate that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE EASY CHAIR

(By Bernard DeVoto)

THE STURDY CORPORATE HOMESTEADER

In a happier time, so a United States Chamber of Commerce speaker tells us, the Government used the public domain to "give every man a chance to earn land for himself through his own skill and hard work." This is the sturdy homemaker sob with which the air will presently resound when this gentleman's associates get to work on Congress. He may have been thinking of the California redwood forest. It was so attractive a part of the public domain that in this generation we have had to raise millions of dollars from rich men and school children to buy back a few acres of it here and there for the public.

Under a measure called the Timber and Stone Act, a homemaker who had his first citizenship papers could buy 160 acres of redwood forest from the Government for $2.50 an acre, less than a panel for your living room costs. Agents of a lumber company would go to a sailors' boarding house on the San Francisco waterfront. They would press a gang of homemakers and lead them to a courthouse to take out first papers. Then they went to a land office and each filed claim to 160 acres of redwood: a quarter section whose number the lumber company had supplied. At a lawyer's office they transferred to the lumber company the homesteads they had earned by skill and hard work, received $50 for services rendered, and could go back to the boarding house. "Fifty dollars was the usual fee," a historian says, "although the amount soon fell to $10 or $5 and eventually to the price of a glass of beer."

Under this act 4 million acres of publicly owned timber passed into corporate ownership at a small fraction of its value, and 95 percent of it by fraud. Under other acts supposed to give every man a chance to earn land for himself, enormously greater acreages came to the same end with the sturdy homemaker's help.

The laws stipulated that the homemaker must be in good faith. Erecting a habitable dwelling on his claim would prove that he was. Or if it was irrigable land, he had to bring water to it, for a homemaker would need water. Under a couple of dozen aliases apiece, employees of land companies or cattle companies would file claim to as many quarter-sections or half-sections of the public domain, and after 6 months would commute them, get title to them, at $1.25 per acre. The sworn testimony of witnesses would prove that they had brought water to the claim; there was no reason for the witnesses to add they had brought it in a can. Or the witnesses swore that they had seen water on the homestead, and so they had, having helped to throw it there cupful by cupful. Or to erect a 12-by-14 cabin on a claim would prove good faith. Homemaker and witnesses neglected to mention that this habitable dwelling was 12 by 14 inches, not feet. Alternatively, a shingled residence established that the homemaker intended to live on his claim; one could be created by fastening a couple of shingles to each side of a tent below the ridgepole. Sometimes a scrupulous corporation would build a genuine log cabin 12 by 14 feet, mount it on wagon wheels, and have the boys drive it from claim to claim, getting the homemaker a lot of public domain in a few hours. In a celebrated instance in Utah the efficiency of this device was increased by always pushing the truck over the corner where four quarter-sections met.

In 6 months the homemakers, who meanwhile had been punching cows or clerking in town, commuted their two dozen parcels of the public domain. They transferred them to their employers and moved on to earn two dozen more quarter-sections apiece by their skill and hard work. Many millions of acres of publicly-owned farmland and grazing land thus passed economically into the possession of corporate homemakers. If the corporation was a land company it might get half a million acres convenient to a railroad right-of-way or within a proposed irrigation district. Or a cattle company could thus acquire a hundred thousand acres that monopolized the water supply for miles and so graze a million acres of the public domain entirely free of charge.

Lumber companies could operate even more cheaply. Their employees need not pay $1.25 per acre or wait to commute their claims. They could pay a location fee, say $6 per 320 acres and the company could forthwith clear-cut the timber and let the claims lapse. At 20 cents an acre virgin stands of white or ponderosa pine, Douglas fir, or Norway or Colorado spruce was almost as good a buy as some of the dam sites which, our propagandist hopes, will presently be offered to the power companies.

These are typical, routine, second-magnitude land frauds in the history of the public domain out West—to describe the bigger ones would require too much space. Enough that in the golden age of landgrabs, the total area of the public domain proved up and lived on by actual homesteaders amounted to only a trivial fraction of the area fraudulently ac-

we must pay a parity, or an equitable, price for our domestically produced materials if we are to maintain our economy on a sound basis. Is it fair then to ask those same domestically produced articles to compete for their own market at a price which is less than their cost of production, or parity?

This bill would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 by requiring that the Secretary of the Treasury impose an equalization duty whenever the import price of supported agricultural commodities is less than its full parity price and whenever the price of critical minerals is less than the "cost of production" parity.

The tariff would be a flexible one which would fluctuate directly with the parity price and it would be an automatic one, going into effect after the Secretary of Agriculture sets up a new parity formula.

The mineral producer has found himself in about the same situation as the agricultural producer. Imports, often subsidized by foreign governments, are flooding our markets and the price of the domestic production is being forced down.

Because of this, I have made provisions, similar to those covering agriculture, for a parity tariff on certain critical minerals. These critical minerals are the ones set up by Defense Minerals Order No. 1 of December 29, 1950, and include such vital minerals as lead, zinc, iron, manganese, aluminum, copper, tin, and mica.

The bill grants authority to the Secretary of the Interior to establish a parity price on these critical minerals on the basis of the domestic cost of production of the mineral as averaged for all domestic producers. This would also be an automatic, flexible tariff which would become effective after the Secretary of the Interior has declared the parity price thereon.

A productive and prosperous America is the first essential in determining and maintaining our foreign and domestic policies and a prosperous America depends in large part upon the payment of parity, or equitable prices for what we buy, whether imported or domestically produced.

This bill has but one main purpose—to assure an American price to American products. Foreign imports are welcomed into this country to help supply American demand and to compete with American producers but those imports should compete on a fair basis—an American standard of living basis.

At the time when our railroads were being developed, this country was faced with a decision similar to the present one—whether to put on a tariff or to allow England to produce the steel for the railroads.

Lincoln, in commenting that he did not know much about tariffs, said, "But here is one thing I do know. If we produce the rails ourselves, we will have both the rails and the money." Because of that decision, we maintained a tariff on steel and the steel industry has become so important that it now produces 50 percent of the steel output of the entire world.

It is my contention, in introducing this bill, that we owe that same opportunity to the mineral and agricultural industries of America.

The 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. (BOB) WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

Wednesday, April 22, 1953

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the El Cajon Valley News:

THE 83D CONGRESS

When the 83d Congress began last January, Speaker JOE MARTIN, Republican, Massachusetts, set its tenor. He said the great objective of the Republican administration is to successfully conclude the Korea war and to convert our present war-born prosperity to a prosperity based on peace.

The Congress is in its fourth month now and an examination discloses pretty well where the Republicans are laying stress to achieve their end.

As was to be expected, they are out to reduce Federal spending.

If they can balance the budget and restore a sound economy while solving the war emergency, they will be well on their way to success.

As the budget stands now—or as it stood when Truman handed it to the new Congress—we will go about $8 million deeper into debt this year.

But not if JOHN TABER, Republican, New York, has his way. This veteran legislator is chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee which handles all revenue bills.

He makes three major recommendations to achieve the desired reduction in spending: (1) Cut from the budget the $7.5 billion earmarked for this year's foreign-aid program; (2) make no appropriations to the military; and (3) allot no money for civilian relief this year.

On their face, these are startling proposals. But Representative TABER points out we have already appropriated enough money to keep foreign-aid program running, full tilt, for the next 3 years. Likewise, the military has enough money for the next 2 years and the Federal relief program, in money, is a full year ahead of itself.

To appropriate money so far in advance, to use JOHN TABER's phrase, "allows too long a lead time."

If the Republicans adopt TABER's recommendations and in doing so manage to balance the budget, Representative DAN REED's (Republican), New York, bill to reduce everybody's personal income tax by at least 11 percent will have a better-than-even chance to pass.

President Eisenhower has said—as has Senator TAFT—he opposes any tax reduction this year. But if Representative TABER can get through his meat-ax cut and a surplus looms—as well it might—they will change their minds.

Next to restoring our economy to a sound footing, foreign policy is rightfully playing the dominant part in the new Republican administration's mind.

What overall plans have been made is not yet clear at this writing. Nor are their details which, quite properly, will remain secret.

But with brains now in the State Department and unquestioned loyalty in John Foster Dulles, things are looking up. His trip to Europe shook both socialist-ridden England and hesitant France. They have learned through his visit they now must fish or cut bait.

However formidable appear the problems of Korea, South Africa, the Pakistan-India squabble, the Iranian oil dispute, the interminable Arab-Israel bickering, Indochina, Formosa, and the rest, with men of good will in charge, they can be surmounted.

MARTIN, TABER, REED, et al, as leaders of the great 80th Congress, did it before. Now, with a sympathetic executive branch, they may do it again.

Oil Group Headed by West Virginia Republican National Committeeman Advised Closing Synthetic-Fuel Plant at Louisiana, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1953

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on April 21, 1953. The article entitled "Oil Group Headed by GOP Chief Advised Closing Plant at Louisiana" follows:

OIL GROUP HEADED BY GOP CHIEF ADVISED CLOSING PLANT AT LOUISIANA—WALTER S. HALLANAN'S PETROLEUM COUNCIL, SET UP TO COUNSEL INTERIOR DEPARTMENT, MADE ADVERSE REPORT ON FUEL FACILITY

(By George H. Hall)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—An adverse report on the operation of the Louisiana (Mo.) synthetic-fuel plant was given the Department of the Interior last February by an oil industry committee headed by Walter S. Hallanan, vice chairman of the Republican National Committee, it was learned today.

The report was made by the National Petroleum Council, a group set up in 1946 to advise the Department on matters of interest to the industry.

Louis C. McCabe, Chief of the Fuels and Explosives Division of the Bureau of Mines, who was responsible for the decision to shut the synthetic plant, said yesterday at a hearing of a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that the Council recommended the closure but exerted no pressure.

Hallanan is head of the Plymouth Oil Co. of Pittsburgh and is Republican national committeeman from West Virginia. He was chairman of arrangements of the Republican National Convention in Chicago last July.

McCabe told the Senate subcommittee he had been forced to accept a $2 million budget cut and decided to apply it to the Louisiana facility.

QUESTIONS BY KILGORE

Senator HARLEY KILGORE, Democrat, of West Virginia, said the closure order, announced by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay last week had defense of the realm aspects, and he wanted to know what would happen to the plant if it was shut down and if an arrangement could not be made for private industry to continue operation.

The facility, said McCabe, would deteriorate rapidly. He estimated it would cost $600,000 to $1,000,000 to place the installation in standby condition, and that 3 years

was about as long a period as it could be kept in standby without serious deterioration. KILGORE said the plant would be junked in about 5 years.

Subcommittee Chairman GUY CORDON, Republican, of Oregon, asked whether the plant could be used for production of ammonia. Three lines for making synthetic ammonia from natural gas are in standby at the plant.

McCabe said it would cost about $1 million to put these lines into production. He added that within a very few years it might become commercially impracticable to produce ammonia from natural gas.

PREFERENCE FOR SHALE

McCabe said no political considerations entered into his recommendation to McKay that the Louisiana plant be closed. He had felt for a year or two that the plant had outlived its usefulness, he declared.

Asked whether he considered national security in making his decision, McCabe replied that he had, and believed processes for producing oil from shale should be pushed. He said it was estimated that there were one hundred to two hundred billion barrels of oil available from shale.

Monsignor Dr. Joseph Tiso

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1953

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following:

Six years ago, on April 18, Monsignor Dr. Joseph Tiso, the duly elected president of the short-lived Republic of Slovakia, went to his death on the gallows. This was murder in its most ghastly and shameful form.

His crime? The brave and gallant Monsignor Tiso went the way of thoussands of fearless men who dared to oppose communism among their respective people. For his outspoken and determined opposition to Soviet Russia and to the Red plan of making Slovakia a Soviet republic, he paid the penalty with his life.

On V–E Day, Dr. Tiso had been acclaimed a hero in the eyes of the people of Slovakia. During his presidency, Slovakia progressed culturally, thrived economically and developed more than it ever had during its exisence as part of the Czechoslovak Republic.

The last free elections of May 26, 1946 gave Monsignor Tiso's party 64 percent of the total votes cast. But the will of the people does not count in the ideology of Moscow and Soviet military force imposed a Communistic political regime upon the Slovak people. So on trumped-up charges, the Reds held a farce of a trial and sentenced Monsignor Tiso to be hanged. This murder set the pattern of what subsequently was to become the fate of all those who had the courage to oppose Red imperialism.

On April 18, 1947, Monsignor Dr. Joseph Tiso, accompanied by a Capuchin priest who had spent the night praying with him, walked up the gallows steps and, while continuing his prayers aloud, sacrificed his life on the altar of freedom and justice. He had preferred death to enslavement.

Real Tests Refute Kefauver on California Tidelands Sentiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1953

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Press-Telegram, Long Beach, Calif., of April 21, 1953:

REAL TESTS REFUTE KEFAUVER ON CALIFORNIA TIDELANDS SENTIMENT

Putting it mildly, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER offered some highly dubious conclusions on the Senate floor last week end when he attempted to interpret the attitude of California and Long Beach people on the submerged land issue.

Senator KEFAUVER is one of a faction of Senators engaged in an unadmitted filibuster against the bill which would quitclaim to the States the tidelands out to historic boundaries. When one talks for the sake of talk and the time it consumes, he runs a chance of making remarks that do not bear up well under examination. That's apparently what happened to the Senator from Tennessee.

KEFAUVER told about some of his experiences in Long Beach and elsewhere when, in early 1952, he ran for the State's Democratic presidential preference. The purport of his remarks was that he, a known advocate of Federal tidelands ownership, was warmly received in the campaign and went on to win the preference election. This, he concluded, proved that the people of Long Beach and of California, do not go along with State ownership of the tidelands as advocated by our congressional delegation and our legislature.

These conclusions of the Senator do not stand up when tested by the circumstances of the 1952 Democratic primary campaign, and they are demolished by the results of the subsequent general election vote of last November.

Senator KEFAUVER contended for California's presidential preference against a group headed by Attorney General Edmund G. Brown. This group embraced the philosophy of President Truman and obviously had his blessing. Truman was even a stronger foe of State tidelands ownership than KEFAUVER. Brown as attorney general, had represented the State officially in the tidelands fight, but had been little more than lukewarm on the subject.

Thus, the tidelands never was a real issue in the Democratic preference contest in California, for California Democrats had no choice between tickets pledged to the two sides of this question. The result of the Democratic primary proved nothing about public opinion on this issue.

In fact, there was plenty of evidence that vast numbers of Democrats were dissatisfied with the choices offered them in their primary and wanted to vote, even in that party affair, for Dwight D. Eisenhower, who happened to be a declared supporter of State ownership. The law did not permit them to vote outside their primary.

Later, in the general election, these California Democrats teamed with Republicans to give Eisenhower, the State ownership advocate, an overwhelming California majority over Adlai Stevenson, who openly declared for Federal tidelands control. That's what happened when there was a choice.

In Long Beach, General Eisenhower received some 76,000 votes to Stevenson's 51,000.

It is readily agreed that many issues affect the outcome of an election. But applying the result to the tidelands issue, which was dramatically publicized here, unquestionably State ownership won the honors.

As so often happens with candidates, Senator KEFAUVER was evidently misled by the warmth of local receptions, and by the discovery of some individuals who agreed with him or at least didn't argue with him on the tidelands issue. He was indeed given a warm welcome here, as he said Saturday. But in his main speech here he did not even mention the tidelands issue; his position came out in answer to questions from the audience and in a press conference. Some of his stanchest supporters here disagreed with him on this question, though they may not have told him so.

All official local bodies, including the city council, favor State ownership of the submerged lands; the chamber of commerce and the central labor council favor it, among many other organizations; candidates of both major parties in congressional contests over the years have favored it. Thirty of California's 32 Congressmen and its 2 Senators are on the side of the State in this contest.

Opinion is not unanimous among Californians on this issue, any more than on any major issue. But every reliable test shows public opinion preponderantly favorable to the cause of State ownership as provided in the bill now before Congress.

Your Son and My Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1953

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting article by James W. Cothran, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, entitled "Your Son and My Blood" appears in the May 1953 issue of the VFW magazine.

In view of the great difficulty encountered by the American Red Cross in securing blood donors, Commander Cothran's article warrants the attention of the American people.

The article follows:

YOUR SON AND MY BLOOD
(By James W. Cothran)

If Uncle Sam has the right to draft your son he should have an equal right to draft my blood. If it is fair to ask your boy to risk his life in defense of this country, in time of war, it is equally fair to ask the able-bodied male citizen to part with a pint or two of his precious blood. The blood he gives will not endanger his life nor in any way injure his health. The blood your son may lose on the battlefield can be the cause of his death.

If service to our country in time of war is the common responsibility of all patriotic citizens, then we should be honest enough to apply this basic principle without discrimination. Loyalty is just as much an obligation for those on the home front as well as those who are ordered to do the fighting.

Star Route Mail Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1953

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STAR ROUTE MAIL CARRIERS

To Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

This is with reference to the report of the Post Office Department made to the Members of Congress under date of April 23, 1953, in explanation of the advertising of star route contracts.

We point out that while the overall statistics in the Department report may be correct as to the figures quoted, the interpretation as stated and as probably expected by the Department gives an entirely distorted presentation of the star route problem and situation. We present the following clarification of the facts:

1. The statement that "the spirit and letter of Public Law 669 maintain that the Postmaster General should use his own discretion, etc.," we believe to be a flat misstatement in view of the report of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service made on May 20, 1948, No. 2003, and which was the basis on which the 80th Congress enacted Public Law 669. Certainly Congress did not intend to give any one man unlimited discretion to disregard the instructions of Congress. The Department is on record as acknowledging the purpose of Congress as late as February 24, 1953, when Assistant Postmaster General John C. Allen stated in a letter to the attorney General of North Carolina, "an examination of the legislative history of Public Law 669 leaves no doubt that in passing this legislation it was clearly the intent of the Congress to provide continuity of service to star route contractors * * *."

2. The 80th Congress enacted Public Law 669 primarily because the bidding system had reduced the star-route service to a state of more or less complete demoralization, when the average rate of pay had been reduced from 13.85 cents per mile in 1924 to 5.82 cents per mile in 1941. We emphasize that this rate per mile included cost of equipment and all labor involved. This caused bankruptcy for many carriers and more than one-half of all star-route contractors in the United States had to petition the Department to be relieved of their contracts during the period 1940–48.

3. During the years since the passage of Public Law 669 on June 19, 1948, about 350 large truck routes have been established in almost all parts of the country, ranging in price from a few thousand dollars per contract per year to $225,000. This relatively new service, and the star route service as a whole, has absorbed more discontinued railway mail contracts than the total increase in cost of star route service mentioned in the Report of the Post Office Department made to Congress (81 percent). In further connection with the 81 percent increased cost mentioned, the Department recognized in November 1951 that the skyrocketing increase in the cost of living and operation warranted increases in the pay of star route contractors without regard to any other factors. It should be noted, the law provides for a reduction in pay as well as increase, where conditions justify a reduction, without resorting to the demoralizing effects of cutthroat bidding.

Sincerely,

FRANK E. RUSSELL,
President.

Pressure From the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
MRS. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1953

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 I made a statement concerning the tidelands-oil issue. I wish today to call attention to an editorial in last Saturday's St. Louis Post-Dispatch on this same subject:

PRESSURE FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

President Eisenhower's intervention in the Senate debate on offshore oil, through his letter to Senator ANDERSON calling for prompt passage of the bill, is a tactical maneuver of Senator TAFT'S, designed to increase the pressure on the opposition.

Whether it has that result or not, the President's action will prove a disappointment to many of his admirers who had believed that his position on the oil giveaway was a result of unfortunate campaign commitments and incomplete awareness of the issues involved.

The President has met open or covert opposition to many parts of the program he presented to Congress at the beginning of the session. But only in behalf of the offshore-oil giveaway has he gone to the lengths of demanding that Congress support his views. Had he given similar backing to other parts of the program—for example, to a reduction of trade barriers for the strengthening of the free world—his present action on oil could be better accepted as the expression of Executive leadership.

Similarly the President is on record with several campaign promises in addition to that concerning the oil giveaway, but appears to show no such sense of urgency about fulfilling them as in this case. Were he as insistent upon immediate tax reduction as upon the offshore oil bill, for example, his present action could be better ascribed to a stern insistence upon literal fulfillment of pledges.

When the 25 Senators opposing the oil bill asked the President to state his views, they undoubtedly hoped that he would examine the important questions raised during the debate, attempt to reconcile the conflicting positions taken by the congressional backers of the bill, his State Department and his Department of Justice, and state a coherent, reasoned philosophy to justify whatever course he recommended.

His reply does none of these things. Without discussing the merits of the giveaway at all, he requests its passage strictly on the ground that the Republican platform calls for it. Many of his well wishers will regret that he did not choose a better cause in which to exert the great powers of his office.

Tests Before Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1953

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, there have been several reports in the daily press appearing in recent weeks concerning phases of a controversy which has to do with the testing of a substance known as battery AD-X2 by the Bureau of Standards. The product is manufactured by Pioneers, Inc., of which Mr. Jess M. Ritchie is the president. The principal office of the business is located in the congressional district which I represent. As phases of the controversy have been considered by congressional committees the information which follows may be of interest to the Members of Congress.

Mr. Ritchie suggested to me that it seemed to appear through the press that the only place in which battery AD-X2 had ever been tested was in the "market place." He stated to me that—

Actually, battery AD-X2 was developed under the direction of the late Dr. Merle Randall, professor emeritus, University of California; coauthor of Thermodynamics and the Free Energy of Chemical Substances (with G. N. Lewis) and an internationally known authority on electrolytic theory. The material was tested by Dr. Randall and * * * Dr. Randall approved all the advertising claims made for the product, prior to his demise in March 1950.

He further informed me "that the advertising claims for battery AD-X2 have not been changed."

He said that he was supplying me with "extracts from the Air Force Report, September 29, 1948; extracts from Massachusetts Institute of Technology, April 6, 1953; and the extracts from the United States Testing Co., Inc., January 28, 1953.

The extracts with which I was supplied are the following:

[Sacramento Air Material Area Teletype No. SMMPF-9-102, relative to battery protecto-charge tests]

SEPTEMBER 29, 1948.

COMMANDING GENERAL, SACRAMENTO AIR MATERIAL AREA,
McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.:
(Att.: SMM.)

1. In reply to subject teletype, authority is granted to conduct test as requested. It is suggested that a comparison test be conducted using a like number of batteries of the types being tested but without protecto-charge treatment. Copies of appropriate battery specifications are being enclosed for use as a guide in accomplishing tests.

2. It is requested that this headquarters be advised, Attn: MCMMXT31, relative to test conclusions.

By command of General McNarney:

JAMES L. JACKSON,
Colonel, USAF, Chief, Maintenance Technical Section, Maintenance Division.

* * * * * *

Specific gravity at end of test 1.180, temperature 62° F.

(c) In view of the above results and the condition the battery was in at the start of the service test, lead acid batteries that have been treated may be stored for a period of 6 months with no detrimental effects. Sulfation in this case has had no effect on the cell as the above charge data revealed the cell did take and hold a charge. The capacity output of this cell is excellent.

(d) Negative cell opened for internal inspection, positive plates were deep rich brown in color with the active material soft and tight to the grid, the grid was soft and very clean. Positive grid bar was clean of chip sulfation that forms on the grid bar. The active material in the negative plates was medium gray in color, tight to the grid. Grid and grid bar was very clean and showed no signs of sulfation.

It takes 3 years from the time funds are appropriated until battle-ready air units are in flight. Those years are eaten up making designs and plans, tools and factories; by producing, testing, and perfecting planes and their intricate equipment; by training men and units. Today's mistakes are tomorrow's tragedies.

Let's look at yesterday's mistakes:

1948: *Reds take over Czechoslovakia.* Russians refuse to allow U. N. commission in North Korea. New Selective Service Act passed. United States Air Force down to 38 groups, understaffed, poor equipment.

Russia estimated to make A-bomb in 4 years. Presidential and congressional commissions study United States air power; establish 70 groups as minimum; to be combat ready 1952. Budget passed. Berlin airlift. Air Force fights "hot" cold war for year. Money for 70 groups goes to airlift. President Truman refuses relief.

Hippity-hop, hippity-hop.

1949: Airshift still on. NATO treaty signed. We agree to go to assistance NATO nations. President Truman limits defense budget. Only partial mobilization of 48 Air Force groups possible. Congress passes funds over President's head. Truman impounds money.

Hippity-hop, hippity-hop.

Still 1949: Defense Secretary Johnson launches wild economy wave. Forty-eight-group Air Force endangered.

September 1949: Russia explodes A-bomb. Military leaders declare United States must be mobilized by 1954. Air Force should go into full production to meet that goal.

Hippity-hop, hippity-hop.

Communists invade South Korea. Joint Chief of Staff ask for 95-group Air Force. 1951: Korean war continues. Senator Lodge calls for Air Force with 150 combat groups plus other supporting air units. General Vandenberg wants 163 groups. Defense Secretary Lovett forces JCS compromise—143-group Air Force. Target date, June 30, 1954.

Hippity-hop, hippity-hop.

1952: No peace in Korea. Danger date of 1954 closer. NATO Council meets in Lisbon. West German Peace Contract signed. Communist danger increases. President Truman starts stretchout. Air Force target date moved forward to 1955, might not be reached by then.

Hippity-hop, hippity-hop, that has been our kangaroo policy for building an Air Force, our prime deterrent against Soviet aggression.

We have never set a goal based on a competent military analysis of what security necessitates. We have not moved steadily and purposefully toward such a goal.

Instead we have put fiscal policies ahead of military strategy and changed our minds so many times that our whole aircraft procurement program has been corrupted by indecision.

This newspaper fought that kangaroo policy all through the Truman administration. General Eisenhower criticized it in his campaign. We hope that his administration will not follow the advice of those who would continue it, who would cut down the flow of plans, funds, materials, and men who are building tomorrow's Air Force today.

Fortunately there are Massachusetts men standing guard. In the past we have had Senator Lodge. Now we have Senator SALTONTALL, top military expert in the Senate: as head of the Armed Service Committee.

And the architect who is working directly with President Eisenhower to build the National Security Council into an effective policy-making body is Boston's Robert Cutler. As a banker he knows the importance of economy, as a citizen-soldier he knows the greater importance of defense.

With the vision and courage of these men the administration can reject the easy way of false economy and create a positive program of steady military growth.

The Submerged Lands Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 27, 1953

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Let's Get Interested," published in the Springfield Daily News of Tuesday, April 21, 1953. It discusses the submerged lands joint resolution now pending before the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S GET INTERESTED

The small but determined band of Senators who have been waging war for the past 3 weeks on the so-called tidelands giveaway bill have been fighting two opponents. One of them is the administration; the other is public apathy.

The electorate at large just can't seem to get interested in the fact that the administration blandly proposes to take away a large slice of the national wealth and give it to a few States who happen to have big deposits of offshore oil within their constitutional boundaries.

If the public gets interested, and it certainly should, it will write letters to its Congressmen. The Congressmen, in turn, will bring pressure to bear on the administration. If the administration remains stubborn, as it has shown every indication that it will, the Congress can still have its own way in the matter.

Toward producing this desired end, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, presented a set of statistics in his maiden Senate speech which ought to help bring some of the suboceanic oil from our western and southern coastlines right into every Bay State home. This is not just a matter of isolated interest. It affects every one of us, and Senator KENNEDY estimates that the multi-billion-dollar gift to the 2 or 3 States involved, will mean that the Federal Government would be taking from $310 to $1,875 from every resident of Massachusetts.

Oil is, and should remain, a national property. Quite apart from the basic principles, which are a part of our concept of democracy, the Federal Government has absolutely no constitutional nor ethical right to take from the many to give to the few. This is usurpation of authority beyond the limits of that authority. There is no sense to the proposal, and no reason for it. There are, however, a good many reasons against it.

One of the most serious is an infringement on personal rights and privileges. If the Federal Government, present or future, finds it can do as it pleases with our national resources, the day will most surely come when those resources will wind up in hands that are not to be trusted.

We do not say that this is the case at present, but why take unnecessary chances with something so vital to our national and international life? By leaving the authority over the tidelands oil where it is at present, in the hands of the Government, which means in the hands of all the people, we can at least be reasonably sure that there won't be any shenanigans with it.

The big and wealthy oil lobbies are doing their level best to wrest the tidelands wealth away from the Federal Government and place it in the hands of the States. Lobbies are not notorious for their lack of self-interest. They are designed, set up, and operated for one purpose—to benefit some person, or some group of persons, in particular.

From this angle alone, we should view this gigantic giveaway plan with distrust and alarm. It has been said, and more than once, that any State legislature is easier to deal with than the National Legislature. Why do the big oil interests want it that way? For the good of all the people? A likely story.

This newspaper completely opposes depriving the American people of any part of their birthright, and that is exactly what the administration is *proposing*. The Supreme Court of the United States has opposed it, and we suggest that the time to stop this infiltration of our basic privileges as American citizens is right now, before it gets out of hand.

No Toad for Ike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1953

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the great qualities of President Eisenhower is his genuine humanness. The people recognized it during the campaign and they feel it now. He is a man you like to know. He has brought a spirit of friendliness and homely virtue to the White House in keeping with the true spirit of America. With all the burdens of his great office on his shoulders, one still gets the feeling that he has time to think of things like campfires burning, a hike in the woods, and a wild stream where trout abound. Something of how Ike affects ordinary people like you and me is contained in the following editorial from the Hokah Chief, weekly paper at Hokah, Houston County, Minn.:

NO TOAD FOR IKE

When one is President of the United States, he is "mighty and alone," said a woman last week. Now it appears he is so alone he cannot even have a toad. In preparation for the first children's party at the White House since the new residents have moved in one little boy who was invited went out into the Potomac woods and caught a toad as a special gift for the new President. He placed the toad in a biscuit tin with hole punched in it and carried it around with him until the party began. However, a woman found out about the toad, took the boy out to a nearby park and put on the pressure.

Said the woman, "We sat down on a bench and I talked to him emotionally and with deep feeling about the future of the toad. I pointed to the White House and asked: 'Is that the place for a toad?' The President goes to work early, and he sees a lot of people all day. The toad will waste away and die." After a few minutes of this sort of talk, the boy weakened and opened the biscuit tin.

We can see no reason why Ike shouldn't have a toad and anyone who has watched him or seen him knows that behind his genially serious face there is a touch of the Huck Finn spirit. And many men and boys have found there is nothing like a good toad around the house. Toads eat less than dogs and they don't bark at friends. Furthermore, instead of shooing them out of the dining room when the soup is put on, you can just pop them in your vest pocket. And it is less expense to build a toadhouse than a doghouse.

If the woman had kept her big nose out of the picture, it's a sure bet that Ike would have accepted the toad.

AMVETS Charge Some Hospital Insurance Companies Defraud Veterans and Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1953

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Miller Tells Gray Insurance Firms Defraud Veterans," which appeared in the National AMVETS of the April 1953 issue:

MILLER TELLS GRAY INSURANCE FIRMS DEFRAUD VETERANS

WASHINGTON.—AMVETS this month charged a number of hospital insurance companies with defrauding veterans and American taxpayers of more than $3 million.

In a letter to VA Administrator Carl R. Gray, National Commander Marshall E. Miller urged Gray to contact all State governors asking them to consult with their State insurance officials and investigate the situa-

Miller's action was the result of a VA report which stated that it was unable to collect more than $3,500,000 annually from certain hospital insurance companies for treatment rendered veterans in VA hospitals.

Miller called on the VA chief to make every effort to recover part of the cost of hospitalization of veterans from any hospitalization insurance policies which such veterans may carry.

COMPANIES SHOULD PAY

He said, "It is a simple matter of sound public morals to expect any insurance company which collects a premium for hospital insurance to pay any hospital which renders service when an insured risk occurs."

Some hospitalization insurance companies have refused to pay claims on the basis of clauses in their policies which relieve them of liability if the insured veteran receives what the companies term as free hospitalization in VA hospitals.

Commander Miller said that AMVETS does not consider any hospital treatment as free since someone has to pay for it and in this case the insurance companies are shifting the burden to the American taxpayer.

Miller pointed out that many reputable insurance companies do pay these claims when billed by the VA.

However, in the case of the other companies who refuse to pay, Miller asked Gray to request State governors to investigate and take action on the matter.

Miller also requested a list of companies refusing to pay claims. He said the list would be circulated among AMVETS and urged all members of the organization to carefully study any hospitalization policies they now carry.

Submerged Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 27, 1953

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful editorial in opposition to the submerged lands joint resolution, known as the Holland joint resolution. The editorial was published in the Chattanooga Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO MUCH IS AT STAKE

Nobody seems to be paying a great deal of attention to the drone of the Senate debate on the submerged oil lands bill. Even the Senators duck out in droves as Members deliver their prepared arguments in measured tones. There is no sense of urgency surrounding the Chamber's consideration of the measure, no apparent realization of the vital importance of what is at stake.

The value goes far beyond the untold wealth of oil waiting to be pumped from beneath the sea, however fabulous it might be. Of greater concern is the emerging pattern of policy covering this Nation's natural resources which, we are beginning to understand, are not limitless after all. The pattern is not rigidly set; administration spokesmen back and fill on specific issues, but in general they show a willingness to go along with the relaxation of Federal controls over natural wealth. And there are those who are eager to take advantage of every sign of softness.

Legislation has been introduced in Congress, for instance, to grant all minerals and mineral rights in the public lands of the United States to the States where they are located. A move has been started to place control of public grazing lands in private hands. Former President Hoover talks of "deempiring" the Government in the field of power production, an attitude which, incidentally, has been rejected by Secretary McKay. The point is, however, that selfish interests are ready to grab at everything in sight.

Federal action against ruthless and destructive exploitation of natural resources has behind it the tradition of half a century of farsighted efforts. The Reclamation Act dates back to 1902, the Forest Service to 1905, and the General Dam Act to guide and govern waterpower development to 1906. And, in 1933, the TVA Act gave specific recognition to the inter-relationship of resources.

Even so, we have seen our natural wealth shrink beneath the impact of war demands and of shoddy management. It has only been in the last few years that demonstrable progress has been made toward the effective conservation of the resources we have left and the replenishment of those which can be replaced.

No wonder that Oscar Chapman, former Secretary of the Interior, raises his voice to warn that this is everybody's fight—no one is unaffected. He urged the establishment of a commission to inventory and appraise our nationally held natural resources before proceeding with a program to dispose of them. No businessman in his right mind would enter into a deal to dispose of properties without knowing exactly what those properties contain and how much they are worth.

It is a sensible recommendation. The wealth belongs to all the people; they should know what is involved. As Mr. Chapman says: "The Federal Government should use its powers to protect the interests of all the people in their great national heritage, and not just some of the people. If we ever lose sight of that we will have lost our greatest resource of all."

Fiftieth Anniversary: St. Michael Archangel Society, Lodge 630, of the Polish National Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1953

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered at the 50th anniversary banquet, St. Michael Archangel Society, Lodge 630, of the Polish National Alliance, on Sunday, April 26, 1953, at Lynn, Mass.

The Communists don't like to see Polish societies celebrating their 50th year of progress like yours is doing today.

They are bothered by the saints who are above their control.

It is encouraging to note that your chapter of the Polish National Alliance has been in business longer than the Politburo.

It will continue to flourish centuries after the Russian people have turned out the Kremlin gang and the curse of communism is banished from the earth.

In Korea today there are thousands of men with Polish blood in their veins who are winning the fight to stop aggression in its tracks.

Yet Poland is nearer to us in distance and closer to us in spirit.

Why aggression was not halted in Poland, where it first violated the post-war peace, is a question that is unanswered because pride and partisanship and petty men will not own up to the mistakes that were made.

In January 1942, 46 governments of the world, including Soviet Russia, signed the Atlantic Charter. This promised that all peoples would have the right to select their own form of government. The charter became the battle cry of the free world in its fight against Hitler and his fellow dictators.

When the war had ended in victory, the Soviets betrayed the Atlantic Charter. By fraud and force Soviet-trained agents were set up as the Government of Poland and the process of crushing Poland began.

We believed in the Russian promise to live up to the charter.

That was our first blunder.

Then we rushed pell-mell to junk our magificent military machine.

That was the second tragic error.

When we woke up, shodtly after, Poland and other nations had been engulfed by Communist imperialism, and it was too late to help. For several years there was much worry in Washington whether we would be able to build up our own defenses again and in time.

Those were the anxious days when we were completely on the defensive; so weak that we couldn't speak up for the captive nations. The Voice of America was without strength to be heard.

We had the A-bomb but no air force.

Most of our Navy was in mothballs.

Our soldiers, sailors, and airmen were civilians again.

Then came the sudden assault on Korea—directed from Moscow.

This naked aggression was the test. Russia was reaching out boldly to take over more nations. Either we looked the other way, as we did with Poland, or we stood our ground. It was a hard decision to make because we were not prepared.

We accepted the challenge.

That was a great and courageous stand to make under the circumstances.

Tidelands Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 28, 1953

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the subject of tidelands oil, from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch under date of April 28, 1953.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator David A. Hees, St. Louis, Democrat, introduced a resolution in the Missouri Senate—Missouri opposing the Holland offshore oil bill and favoring the Hill amendment. The Hess resolution says:

"It is obvious that these vast natural resources belong to all the people and not wholly to those residents in States bordering the sea."

If the resources were exhausted, the resolution continues, every State would be compelled to contribute to the cost of discouraging and developing new sources of supply.

Post-Dispatch today applauds this resolution in an editorial entitled "Missouri's Chance To Speak Up."

Senator Hess, of St. Louis, has introduced a resolution which should receive the proper attention of the Missouri Senate. It opposes the legislation pending in the United States Senate to turn over the Nation's offshore oil reserves to the 3 States of California, Texas, and Louisiana. The people of the United States says Hess' resolution "will be better served if the oil reserves are controlled by the Federal Government for the welfare of all citizens."

It is late and the United States Senate may very well act before Missouri's Senate can speak. But the voice of this State lawmakers utter in opposition to the give away cannot but have a good effect. Several other States have already spoken to the same purpose.

If Missouri's voice makes only 1 Senator at Washington stop and reconsider, it will be well worthwhile. It will, furthermore, stand as a warning against proposed further raids on the public domain. Even if it were only for the record, it would be worth doing.

May the Hess resolution quickly become the official resolution of Missouri's Senate.

Religious Persecution in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 27, 1953

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, recently at a mass meeting in Chicago held at the Northwest Armory, Gen. Kazimierz Sosnkowski made an address at a protest rally against religious persecution in Poland, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. KAZIMIERZ SOSNKOWSKI AT PROTEST RALLY AGAINST RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN POLAND, HELD ON MARCH 22, 1953, AT NORTHWEST ARMORY, CHICAGO, ILL.

I am deeply thrilled as I look upon the thousands gathered here from all corners of Chicago to participate in this rally. I look upon you and I know that our hearts beat at this moment in perfect rhythm and our thoughts fly in unison across oceans to our unhappy motherland, the land of your fathers and forefathers. Today, in faraway Poland, after liquidation of independent political parties, after the breaking down of the intelligentsia, after crushing underfoot of everything that is of the past and tradition, after enslavement of the arts and sciences, after conquering economic and social life, now comes the turn to storm the citadels and souls of the youth, to conquer the soil-loving peasants and last, but not least, to attack the last and strongest redoubts—the Catholic Church.

We are gathered here today, in order to declare to the whole free world, a protest in deepest conviction against the terrible persecution of religion and the church in Poland. We hold hope that the echos of today's manifestation will reach our old country. At this time when our brothers and sisters in Poland are holding out alone in defense of the soul of the nation, the knowledge that we here in the largest community of Polish Americans are with them with heart and thought, will surely be a stimulus to them and will give them strength to resist.

The history of the Polish nation from the very beginning is linked with the life and development of the church and Catholicism. All the important and most beautiful moments lived by our nation were linked in some kind of religious thought and action. It is impossible to recount in a short speech the countless examples of how the Catholic church in Poland and the Polish nation fought and suffered side by side while building and strengthening national, economic, and spiritual foundations of the country.

The often-repeated phrase "Poland was the bulwark of Christendom," takes on a new and deeper meaning today, after so many battles of the Polish soldier with modern paganism and in the face of present religious persecutions in Poland.

Over the span of a thousand years our history is entwined with religion and many were the battles fought by Poland in defense of Christianity. Centuries ago the flower of Polish knighthood fell with Prince Henry the Pious at Lignica in stemming the advance on Europe of the Mongol hordes.

Later in history came the beautiful and inspiring unification of three Catholic countries—Poland, Lithuania, and Ruthenia, sealed by the treaty of Horodle. The preamble of that historic document announced: "Every true act of God is based on brotherly and Christian love and therefore, all of us, prompted by this love, desire union between our nations."

And then later, when Europe was threatened by the power of the crescent, Poland alone for nearly 200 years fought continuous battles in defense of the church and Christian civilization. The might of the advancing Turks was crushed at Vienna by Polish King Jan Sobieski in 1683. This great victory brought no gains to Poland and little or no thanks and praise from the European nations. But this Christian deed by Poland will live on in our history as a shining example of our contribution to the defense of western civilization.

There are many shining lights throughout Polish history bearing names of illustrious churchmen; in fact, too many to mention here. They stand honored beside our military heroes as saviours of our Nation in times of greatest crises.

History repeats itself peculiarly, but the prime character of Russian imperialism, whether white or red, always remains the same. About 200 years ago the Russian aggressor through its Ambassador to Poland abducted two church leaders from the Polish diet in session, the senators and patriots, Bishops Soltyk and Puzyna, and deported them into deep Russia. Today's religious persecutions in Poland, trials of clergymen, arrests and deportation of bishops, are intended by order of Moscow as a preparation for transfer of Poland to the 18th Soviet republic.

Communism having gained complete rule in Poland is now attacking the strongest outpost which is the church. The Communists are reaching out to gain the soul of the Polish Nation through persecution of religion.

I know that today's protest rally will be made known to the people of Poland for it it being recorded on tape for transmission to that enslaved country by both the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. What we declare here in Chicago will give our Polish brethren in Poland encouragement to resist all persecutions. We shall tell them that we are with them in heart and thought. Today's religious persecution in Poland, arrests and deportations of priests and bishops on order from Moscow is another step in the planned incorporation of Poland into U. S. S. R. as the 18th Republic. America will save the world through its material power and its spiritual forces, the symbol of which is the sign of the cross.

Home on the Range

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 21, 1953

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 17, 1953, entitled "Home on the Range."

Mr. Speaker, the editorial raises storm signals on a piece of legislation which is before the Congress at this time—H. R. 4023. Before it is time for Congress to make its decision upon this legislation, I am concerned chiefly that my colleagues shall be fully advised as to the issues involved. It has always been the policy of our Federal Government to place its lands into private ownership as soon as possible. However, it has never been its policy, with but few exceptions such as the Teapot Dome matter and other isolated instances, to place its property into private ownership at the expense of our citizens, individually and collectively. I am hopeful that the Members of Congress will study this particular legislative proposal very carefully. The basic issue involved is very simple; that is, the public interest versus private profit. Our chief concern should be to see that the Federal Government receives value in return and that the interests of the public, generally, are protected. The editorial follows:

HOME ON THE RANGE

Now that the bills to give away offshore oil are well advanced, a new sort of land grab

We've got to face up to realities and broadcast the fact that America's No. 1 fuel industry is in danger of collapse.

For too long now we have whispered to one another that the coal industry is sick. Free and open discussion has been taboo because nearly everybody feared it would make matters worse.

It's time we throw caution to the winds and tell the country what's happening in their biggest coal-producing State. When the President thinks the coal industry is enjoying prosperity how can other people be expected to know otherwise?

Bituminous coal production is more than 20 percent below the level of last year, which was considered a poor year, and coal-using industries are making conditions worse in the wake of peace talks in Korea by canceling orders and digging into the Nation's 80-million-ton stockpile.

In 3 months, says Joseph E. Moody, president of the Southern Coal Producers' Association, 14 mines employing 2,500 workers closed. Prior to that time 51 mines in West Virginia ceased operations, says Walter R. Thurmond, an official of the West Virginia Coal Association.

What has all this done to the economy? In this State, where 2 out of every 3 people depend either directly or indirectly on the mining of coal, dire things are happening.

Approximately 7,500 miners have been thrown out of work in 2 of 3 United Mine Workers districts. Other miners have been reduced to a subsistence living standard by 1-, 2-, and 3-day work weeks. Railroads, three of them depending on coal mining for more than 50 percent of their tonnage, have laid off shopmen and train crews.

All kinds of businesses have closed their doors. Others are hard put to make ends meet. Miners are leaving West Virginia for jobs in defense industry. Churches cannot pay their pastors. Tax revenue is dwindling, and government agencies are wondering how they will build roads, keep schools open for full terms, and operate other vital services.

West Virginia borders on a first-rate recession in a country rolling along on the crest of prosperity, and all indicators point to a worsening situation. Unless, of course, Congress comes to the aid of the coal industry.

The reasons for the slump in coal sales are fourfold:

1. A cutback in coal exports. Last year's export total was 26 million tons, 8 million tons below 1951. Exports this year are expected to drop even more.

2. A mild winter.

3. Competition from other domestic fuels.

4. A sharp increase in imports of residual oil. Some 126 million barrels of this oil, used as fuel for industrial furnaces, were imported last year, and no abatement in residual flow is anticipated this year.

We can't shove coal down the throats of foreign countries, weather is a province of the heavenly bodies, and competition from other fuels is in the fine old free-enterprise tradition. Congress can't be expected to interfere there. But foreign residual oil is another matter. Congress should limit the dumping of this cheap oil for national security's sake as well as the economic well-being of coal-producing States.

L. Ebersole Gaines, former president of the National Coal Association and present head of the West Virginia Coal Association, warned a congressional committee 3 years ago what would happen if this indiscriminate dumping of foreign residual oil was not stopped. He said:

"Employment is decreasing, mines are being allowed to go out of production and are being dismantled, and the transportation facilities, of course, are seriously affected.

"If this foreign oil continues to be dumped, coal mines will go out of existence, coal miners will be scattered, and should a sudden need arise for an unlimited supply of fuel such as arose in World Wars I and II, when even oil refineries in the United States used coal for fuel, fuel and industrial energy will not be available."

Coal mines cannot be kept in storage, Gaines told the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare. If unused, they deteriorate and are gone in a short time, and from 1 to 2 years are required to open up a new mine.

Gaines' voice was but a cry in the wilderness 3 years ago. There was prosperity everywhere then, or so it seemed, for the Korean war had just started. Neither we in West Virginia nor people elsewhere heeded his warning. But he prophesied right.

Recession has come, and grave industrial dislocations are in the making. We in America's greatest coal-producing State must sound the warning. We owe it to our country as well as ourselves to tell the true story about the ailing monarch, Old King Coal.

Double Dealer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1953

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that I can say which would add to the following editorial which appeared in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of last Sunday.

This editorial says everything on the subject there is to say and says it in such a way that Editor George W. Healy, Jr., of the Times-Picayune, should be very proud.

If certain people in the other body across the hall should happen to read this editorial, there should be some very crimson faces.

Here is the editorial:

DOUBLE DEALER

Whatever else 3 weeks' senatorial "debate" on the submerged lands bill has done, it has served to show up the opposition New Deal faction in several unfavorable but not too surprising aspects. Scarcely any impartial student would fail to describe the prolonged, tiring, time-killing, continuous round of opposition speeches as a filibuster, particularly because of the host of irrelevancies introduced by some material-shy speakers.

But the New Deal group is opposed, on principle, to the filibuster, and cannot bring itself to admit that that is what is being attempted. A growing number have gone on record, in what amounts to an insult of public intelligence, with outright denial. Among Senators who do not profess the highmindedness and civic-social sanctity of New Dealers, such flouting of demonstrable fact is regrettable but not wounding. But you wouldn't expect it of our modern nobility. Or would you?

To find Senator DOUGLAS, one of the few of the Romans on whom the toga of virtue has not appeared too crudely draped, joining repeatedly in the "Tain't so" chorus, elicits even from those who differ with him a mournful "Et tu, Paule!"

It is hazardous to plumb the psyche of a faction. But that faction was on public display for more years than we care to remember, unhampered by fear that its "tax, hijack, borrow, squander, preach" tactics ever would be brought to book. Is it too unfair to suggest that playing both sides of the street (as in the case of a filibuster) and assuming that the public is too dumb to understand, are part and parcel of that pseudo-cleverness which seems to stamp the pseudo-liberal of today?

No one objected to the right of the tidelands grabbers to spread on the record the voluminous bulk of their oft-told objections to States' ownership, and their dreams of more socialized spending (which conflict materially with the conservation angle also drummed up). They have run out of things to say and their choice has long been plain: filibuster or vote.

Only on compelling matters of national security should debate-closing in the Senate be made easier. But the New Dealers, and some others, want all or nothing. Say they in effect: If a rule is good in most cases, it is good in all; and unless it be changed, then the country, if necessary, must burn while Nero gabbles.

Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1953

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a poll of the people in the First Congressional District of Arkansas on questions of far-reaching concern both domestically and internationally has just been concluded. Questionnaires were sent out to all box holders, rural, and star-route patrons in the 10-county district. The response of the constituents was phenomenal.

The purpose of the poll was two-phase, the principal of which was to make a determination of the thinking, opinions, and attitudes of those who resided in the First Arkansas District to arrive at conclusions on vital issues within limits and in accordance with one's own best judgment, another factor being to stimulate the people's interest in public affairs. The questions asked and the results of the poll are as follows:

[Percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor applying greater pressure and intensifying our efforts in Korea as a means of gaining peace?	90.7	6.5	3.9
2. Do you favor blockading Communist China?	90.6	7.2	2.2
3. Do you favor continuing arms to our allies?	86.4	10.9	2.7
4. Do you favor a defense pact in the Pacific area similar to the NATO?	74.8	11.8	13.4
5. Do you favor Federal expenditures for the point 4 program for the development of backward nations?	48.9	47.5	3.6
6. Do you favor cutting the budget for foreign aid?	64.4	30.6	5.0
7. Do you favor reduction in defense spending which would delay the planned 143-wing Air Force as well as the development of the atomic energy program?	11.9	85.5	2.3
8. Do you favor the continuation of price supports at 90 percent of parity?	73.6	23.2	3.2
9. Do you favor the sliding scale support plan under which the support price is smaller when the supply of the commodity increases?	41.1	52.2	6.7

on the protest the legislator made to the Department of Defense concerning the dropping of Indiantown Gap Military Reservation as a Federal training center.

"The Government means business," MUMMA said, "in its plans for trimming the national budget."

He pointed out that the Army has promised a written report on its review of the case involving withdrawal from Indiantown Gap, but indicated the outlook for a reversal of its previous decision is dim.

This was confirmed this morning when Army officials in Washington announced they are going ahead with plans to deactivate the reservation as a Federal training post.

Other informed sources said that more than three additional military installations will be closed. Prominently mentioned are such places as Camp Pickett, Va., and Fort Ord, Calif.

That the termination of Federal troop training at Indiantown Gap is part of a nationwide program of retrenchment was emphasized when a complete list of military installations already closed was given the Lebanon Daily News by Congressman MUMMA.

They are Fort Lawton, Fort Flagler, and Fort Warden, all in the State of Washington; Camp Edwards, Mass.; Camp Drum, N. Y.; Fort Hancock, N. J.; Camp McCoy, Wis.; Camp Cooke, Calif.; Fort Huachuca, Ariz.; Fort Custer, Mich.; and the Army transmitter station, Alexandria, Va.

Most of these camps are at least the size of Indiantown Gap and some are even bigger. A number of the forts were regarded as permanent installations and their closing came as a complete surprise.

Army officials emphasized that Indiantown Gap Military Reservation will continue on a standby basis even though the Fifth Infantry Division will be deactivated.

It is indicated the summer training program for National Guard and Reserve units will be intensified, which means Indiantown Gap Military Reservation will be busier than usual during the summer.

Congress and Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRICE DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 7, 1953

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Star entitled "Congress and Tidelands."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND TIDELANDS

By an emphatic vote of 56 to 35, the Senate has now joined the House in enacting legislation to settle the long-standing Federal-State controversy over the so-called tidelands. This has been one of the hottest of all our postwar domestic issues, none of which has been the subject of more misrepresentation or articulate ignorance. To understand that, it is necessary only to glance through the record of the pretentious month-long filibuster staged by Mr. MORSE and what he has chosen to call—self-righteously—his "little band of liberals."

As in past Congresses, however, this "little band of liberals" has utterly failed to convince the large bipartisan majority. It has repeated all of the old hackneyed arguments against quitclaim legislation, all the old exaggerations, all the old half-truths and distortions, all the old impudent talk suggesting that men of honor and integrity could not vote for such legislation without tarring themselves with the brush of larceny against the Nation. But men of honor and integrity in both Houses, Democrats and Republicans alike, have nonetheless voted for it.

Why? They have done so because of a firm conviction—a straightforward, sincere, altogether honest conviction—that the States chiefly involved in this issue are morally and legally entitled to ownership of the submerged lands and resources lying within their historic seaward boundaries. In the case of Texas and Florida, that means 10½ miles out, while in the case of Louisiana, California, and others, it means 3 miles out. As for the vast area of the Continental Shelf beyond—an area that contains the overwhelming bulk of the Nation's offshore wealth—both the Senate and House bills recognize that that belongs to the whole country under the trusteeship of the Federal Government.

The House bill—enacted in March by a vote of 285 to 108—is better than the Senate bill in that it more clearly defines and delimits what belongs to the coastal States and what to the country as a whole. Further than that, it has the added virtue of providing specific authority for national development of the resources in the Federal area. But these differences between the two versions can either be reconciled in conference or taken care of by separate legislation. The important thing is that both point the way to a fair and equitable solution of an issue that has vexed the Nation far too long.

Of course, the "little band of liberals" still cry that all this adds up to a gigantic and villainous "giveaway." And they say dark things about how the issue will be carried again to the Supreme Court. But the Supreme Court has never ruled against the sort of action taken by the Senate and House. Actually, far from ruling against it, the Justices have left no room for doubt about the power of Congress to enact such legislation. Accordingly, whatever litigation may ensue, and despite the vetoes of his predecessor, President Eisenhower will be on sound ground when he signs—as he has promised to—the quitclaim bill likely to be sent to him in the very near future.

Farm Support Program and Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1953

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, everyone who is interested in the problems of agriculture, the farm support program, and particularly on poultry and eggs and other problems of the eastern farmer, should be interested in the attached article recently appearing in the Vineland Times Journal. Quoting the Wall Street Journal, Ben Leuchter then points out the "squeeze" which the present program applies to the poultry and egg farmer, as well as the fact that the support program unjustly enriches the efficient farmer and cannot do too much for the marginal farmer after all.

A reexamination of this entire program toward the end of its improvement and not its abolition seems desirable. The editorial follows:

EQUAL TREATMENT WANTED

Although New Jersey egg producers haven't been too unhappy of late about the prices of their product, they are never sure when the sales value of a dozen eggs will take an unseasonal dip.

Since this newspaper's weekly poultry section is published today and mailed to many hundreds of poultrymen outside the immediate Vineland area who cannot receive it daily by carrier, we thought it relevant to discuss an editorial which appeared Wednesday in the Wall Street Journal.

"Down on the plantation, where the mule is still king," the editorial started, "it costs about 27.9 cents a pound, exclusive of land costs, to grow and market a pound of cotton. Where the farm is partly mechanized, it costs 22.1 cents a pound. With fully mechanized operation, this cost drops to 13.5 cents.

"These are the calculations of Dr. Grady B. Crowe, agricultural economist for the United States Department of Agriculture, and they show again the difficulties a government runs into when it tries to guarantee 'fair' farm prices.

"What price is fair to what farmer?" the newspaper asks. "Is the Government to set the support level high enough to guarantee a profit for the cotton farmer whose operating cost is 27.9 cents a pound, thus keeping in production the most expensive producers and insuring tremendous profits for the progressive farmer who can turn it out at 13.5 cents a pound?

"Or is the Government to cut out the marginal producers? And if so, how does it decide where is the margin? What price level is required by the economy, what by the political pressures of the moment.

"Our present farm price-support program is based on a price relationship 40 years old. The idea of parity is that the crops the farmer grows ought to be worth in terms of other goods what they were worth in the years 1910 and 1914, without any regard for changing production methods or changing price relationships over a period of two generations.

"The result of this concept is inevitably just what we have in a hugely expensive farm program which hands out exhorbitant subsidies to some really efficient farmers and yet which, for all of its cost, still does not assure much profit for the least efficient farmers.

"The disparity in costs and profits among farmers is not limited to mechanization; it is meshed with the whole science of farming and land use. In Mississippi, for instance, cotton yields average 380 pounds per acre; in Arizona 727 pounds per acre. The wide variations in yields can mean a difference in harvesting costs from a high of $24.50 a bale to a low of about $8.20 a bale.

"Most Government officials—indeed, most farmers themselves—have come to recognize that the price-support level is too high; the dramatic absurdities of the potato and butter programs threaten in other fields. But when they seek some other standard for fairness or some other historical period for parity they are as lost as under the present program.

"There may be some justification for an absolute minimum price support to avoid sudden catastrophes. But basically there is no governor other than the market place which will match the Nation's requirements for farm products with the maximum economic use of our resources to supply those products."

One rarely hears the poultry farmer pleading for higher Government support prices. He is willing to take his chances in the market place, but what he objects to are subsidies paid to grain farmers which increase

an abuse of the treaty power, and he further argued that it would restrict the Government's freedom of action in foreign affairs to do so.

The Secretary went on to say that he still shares the concern of the many citizens who bring to the attention of the public their fears about the abuse of the treaty power, just as he himself voiced them a year ago. But he explained: "I point out that the arousing of that concern was a correction of the evil."

Mr. Dulles said this evil is corrected because the present administration will not use the treaty power to "effect internal social changes." He said the present administration is committed to the exercise of the treaty-making power "only within constitutional limits," and that he does not believe "treaties should, or lawfully can, be used as a device to circumvent the constitutional procedures established in relation to what are essentially matters of domestic concern."

Then, to prove good faith, he said that the United States Government, under the present administration, would not sign the Convention on Political Rights of Women or either of the proposed Covenants on Human Rights, nor will it press for ratification of the Genocide Convention.

It is fortunate that we have in office a President and a Secretary of State who recognize that there are dangers in the abuse of the treaty power and who are committed not to abuse it. But the recognition by Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles that the treaty power can be evilly used does not correct the evil that lies in the existence of the power to abuse.

For Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles can speak only for their administration. Their attitude toward the various proposed conventions and covenants, for one example, is not that of the former administration and this administration's pledge is not binding on the next one. Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles cannot bind future administrations any more than Mr. Truman could bind this one.

There has been much testimony before the Senate subcommittee in favor of an amendment to define the powers of treaties; two drafts of such an amendment are now pending in Congress. The roots of this problem, as our Mr. Fitzpatrick recalls elsewhere on this page, go back far beyond the Eisenhower administration.

But in our opinion Mr. Dulles, in his statement opposing such an amendment, is the most convincing witness of all for the need to safeguard the Constitution from encroachment by treaty.

For what he really said was that we ought to depend not upon laws but upon men, and not upon constitutional restraints but upon the self-restraint of whoever may be in power at the moment.

For the present administration to say "these things are bad and they can be done, but we will not do them" is not enough. It is no guaranty that they will not be done at some future date by different people. Simply to point out an evil is not to correct it. The way to correct an evil is to eliminate it. One does not just chase the red fox from the hencoop; one kills the fox so that he will not come back some other time.

Setting the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS SMITH
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 8, 1953

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Chapel Hill Weekly of May 7, 1953, published by Mr. Louis Graves, at Chapel Hill, N. C.

As a prefacing observation, I should like to identify Mr. Graves as one of North Carolina's most respected newspapermen. No man, in or out of Mr. Graves' profession, will contest that statement.

Mr. Graves has a certain uniqueness about him which has won for him and his newspaper a distinct admiration, not only in my own State, but throughout the Nation, as well. The New York Times and many other leading publications often quote his writings, and thus manifestly subscribe to his philosophies, which are both considered and wise.

Louis Graves does not race with a clock. The Chapel Hill Weekly is not that sort of publication. Because he remains calm and deliberative, he is not guilty of succumbing to intemperate journalistic emotionalism.

I pay tribute to Louis Graves here, not because he is in agreement with a position taken by the Senate which I considered correct, but because I admire his intellectual honesty and sincerity. I think most Senators will appreciate that the editorial which follows is based on an awareness of the true facts, free from the rampant emotionalism which engulfed the issue at hand.

I believe this editorial of Louis Graves can bring to the minds of those who were not able to follow in detail the argument over the 5 weeks, a certain understanding of the so-called tidelands issue that has not been had by many persons who have not understood the import of some of the speeches made or the representations made on the floor of this body.

I believe Mr. Graves has done the majority of the Senate a great service in calling attention in his editorial column to some of the items, in the manner in which he has mentioned them.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I ask that the editorial by Louis Graves, as printed in his newspaper, the Chapel Hill Weekly, of Chapel Hill, N. C., on May 7, 1953, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Keep on repeating a statement, dinning it into people's ears and putting it before their eyes in print day after day, and they will believe it without regard to whether it is true or not. Hitler laid that down as one of the principles basic to successful government, and many another man has acted upon it though he may not have been so frank in stating it.

A good illustration of the effect of ceaseless repetition is the attack on the purpose of Congress, a purpose which may have been translated into action by the time these words appear, to clear the States' title to under-water land as far as 3 miles off-shore (10½ miles in the case of Texas and the west coast of Florida because of treaty rights existing when these States became part of the Union).

Only an infinitesimal proportion of the people of the United States have any knowledge of the history of this subject, or of the great weight of judicial support for the claims of the States, hence millions of newspaper readers and radio listeners, who see and hear practically nothing of the other side, are easily persuaded to accept the false statement that Congress is giving away property that belongs to the Nation. Congress is doing nothing of the sort. It is merely confirming the States' ownership of property that is rightly theirs and has been repeatedly declared to be theirs by the Nation's greatest legal minds.

The long succession of opinions to this effect were reversed by the Supreme Court in the suit brought by the Government against the State of California and decided in 1947. Justice Hugo Black wrote the majority opinion. Dissents were entered by Justices Frankfurter and Reed. The similar Texas case was decided by four of the nine Supreme Court justices, with two dissents and three members of the court not sitting. This is the only case in history in which an important constitutional question has been decided by less than a majority of the Court.

Among the justices in the past who rendered opinions agreeing with the dissents of Frankfurter and Reed and differing from the opinion written by Justice Black were Chief Justices Stone, Hughes, Taft, White, Fuller, Chase, and Taney, and Associate Justices Cardozo, McReynolds, Pitney, Harlan, Owen J. Roberts, and Oliver Wendell Holmes.

The declarations of the Supreme Court over a period of more than 100 years, on the question of the ownership of lands under tidewaters are summed up in this passage from an opinion rendered by Justice Lucius Q. C. Lamar in 1891: "It is the settled rule of law in this Court that absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over, the soils under the tidewaters in the Original States were reserved to the new States and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty and jurisdiction in that behalf as the Original States possess." This was repeated, in substance, in opinions by Justice Holmes in 1903, Chief Justice Fuller in 1906, Justice Brandeis in 1921, Chief Justice Taft in 1926, and Chief Justice Hughes in 1935.

The president of the National Association of Attorneys General presented to Congress, at a recent hearing, a record of the approval by 47 of the 48 States of the Union of the bill to confirm the States' ownership of the offshore lands according to all decisions of the Supreme Court before 1947. For the last 5 years, the States' representatives have been appearing before committees of Congress to register the States' opposition to the National Government's seizure of the States' property.

The bill to prevent such seizure has already passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority. When it was introduced in the Senate by Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, 39 Senators joined him in sponsoring it.

Regardless of the merits of the past opinions of Supreme Court justices and the recent opposing opinions, it is not disputed that Congress has the right to issue to the States a quitclaim to the tidelands. In its decision in the California case in 1947 the Court affirmed this right, saying: "Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution vests in Congress 'power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.' We have said that the constitutional power of Congress in this respect is without limitation. Neither the courts nor the executive agencies could proceed contrary to an act of Congress in this congressional area of national power."

President Eisenhower was talking both good sense and justice when he said in his speech in New Orleans last October:

"State ownership of the lands and resources beneath inland and offshore navigable waters is a long-recognized concept. It has not weakened America or impaired the orderly development of such resources. The resources of these submerged areas, though still owned by the States, will be available for America's defense in time of national emergency. Twice by substantial majorities both Houses of Congress have

voted to recognize the traditional concept of State ownership of the submerged areas. Twice these acts have been vetoed by the President. The law twice passed Congress which would recognize the State titles is in keeping with basic principles of honest dealing and fair play."

British Ally Reveals Cold Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday May 8, 1953

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on May 7 of this year the Washington Evening Star published an article entitled "British Ally Reveals Cold Heart," written by David Lawrence. The subject matter of this article is so very important and thought-provoking that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH ALLY REVEALS COLD HEART—SHE SENDS STRATEGIC GOODS TO SOVIET AND HIDES BEHIND FICTION THAT RUSSIA IS NOT AN AGGRESSOR LEGALLY

(By David Lawrence)

Gradually, and with unashamed frankness, the British are conceding that they think it is more important for them to continue their trade with Communist countries than to help the United States put economic pressure on the Soviet Union even as the latter supplies to Red China guns and munitions with which to kill American boys in Korea.

But, what is much worse, the evidence now indicates that the Department of State feels helpless to change the allied point of view. This has just been uncovered in testimony before congressional committees, and it points up as a paramount issue whether the Eisenhower administration intends to use its diplomatic influence effectively and whether Congress will use its appropriations to make sure that an embargo on all trade with Communist countries is inaugurated.

Great Britain today sends no strategic materials to Red China, but admits sending them to the Soviet Union and hides behind the fiction that Communist Russia is not legally an aggressor.

The other day a letter appeared in a Washington newspaper signed "Diplomat" which was written presumably by someone connected with one of the British Commonwealth Embassies. *He said:*

"The British have to live with—and, to a certain extent, by—trade with the Soviet bloc. They sell rubber to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the European satellites, and refuse to sell it to Communist China, as a part of the policy which recognizes their need for grains and timber from the European Soviet bloc; which looks to the legal situation in which Red China is an aggressor under the U. N. resolution but the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not; and which strives to achieve a sensible balance.

"Like all compromises, the balance they strike may seem inconsistent, and may, in fact, be inconsistent or stupid or wrong. But it is their official policy in a matter of great delicacy."

Surely this is a matter of great delicacy for the parents and relatives of the more than 130,000 American boys who have become casualties in Korea. One wonders when the British Government will discover that it is more important to put economic pressure on the Communist countries and bring the cold war to an end than it is to seek profits no matter where they can be obtained.

Surely, also, out of the five to six billions of economic aid about to be voted by Congress to foreign countries, some few millions might be earmarked to buy the timber Britain needs and to absorb the freight expense from distant points and thus aid in every way to achieve the sensible balance the British want. It would cost $800 million a year to buy up the East-West trade. The American people would gladly pay it to end the cold war.

Surely to bribe or induce the British producers with American dollars cannot be less harmful if trade is to be maintained than to let them be influenced by Soviet rubles or commodities—and if money is the only consideration, perhaps the American Congress can agree to pay the expense of a complete embargo. It would be worth while to do so if American lives could be saved in Korea. For rubber is a strategic material, and when rubber is sold by Britain to the Soviet Union, every one knows it is shipped over the trans-Siberian railway to Red China just as certainly as if it had been sent there by boat direct.

It was Senator MCCARTHY who recently uncovered the scandal in foreign shipping which reveals that citizens of various countries, including Britain, are engaged in selling directly to Red China. Then, all of a sudden, the European press began to denounce McCarthyism with far more vigor than would normally be expected from a foreign press which has so little interest in whether subversives are being driven out of the American Government. Now the London Times has revealed the real animus against Senator MCCARTHY—he is exposing the details of the improper trade with the Communists. The British newspaper says:

"The McCarthy policy, if one can dignify it by such a name, would logically lead to the stopping of all trade with the whole of that part of the world that is under Soviet influence, without regard to the strategic or nonstrategic character of the goods carried. It would mean, on the trade front, a general state of war.

"The idea seems to be gaining fresh hold in the United States that trade with a Communist country is in itself wrong."

To most Americans—and now President Eisenhower has agreed—the fighting in Korea is not a police action but a war. And when there is a war going on, Americans have been taught to believe it is wrong to trade with the enemy. During World War I, before America entered the conflict, Great Britain seized American vessels carrying cargoes to neutral countries because they might ultimately get to enemy countries. In World War II, the United States and Great Britain bought up the production of neutral countries to prevent its going to enemy countries.

The U. N. has adopted a resolution calling on all members to refrain from aiding the aggressors. This wasn't a hairsplitting resolution which said there could be exceptions if some country wanted to make profits or if some country wanted to send her strategic materials to a country bordering on Russia. The embargo resolution was clear cut, and the question now is how do the British and other nations justify the use of shipping to permit trade directly or indirectly with the enemy?

On top of all this, Premier Nehru, of India, has announced that India does not and will not accept the U. N. embargo on strategic materials. How can the other U. N. members now allow India to remain a member of that organization? This is another question which deserves a realistic answer.

The Power of Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 8, 1953

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Power of Treaties—Its Threat to Constitutional Safeguards Raises National Debate," written by William H. Fitzpatrick, and published in the Wall Street Journal of April 9, 1953.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POWER OF TREATIES—ITS THREAT TO CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS RAISES NATIONAL DEBATE

(By William H. Fitzpatrick)

Just now there is a great debate going on in Washington and, as usual with such great debates, the United States Constitution is right in the middle of it all.

The present debate is about whether the Constitution ought to be amended to prevent an abuse of the treaty power. Both sides of this debate admit that there is no express limitation to the power of the President and the Senate to make treaties nor is there any limitation to the kind of treaties that can be made.

Those who want the treaty power left unlimited say that to change it will restrict the President in the conduct of international affairs. Those who want a limitation placed on the abuse of the treaty power say that what they want is not a restriction on the power of the President and the Senate to make treaties. What they seek is a limitation on the kind of treaties which can be made.

The debate therefore is not about the treaty power. It is about the powers of treaties.

Those who want the powers of treaties limited include 64 United States Senators who have cosponsored the Bricker amendment; the American Bar Asoociation; sponsors of an amendment introduced by Senator WATKINS; the National Association of Attorneys General, and a number of organizations not particularly identified with legal or foreign affairs. Leading the opposition to the proposed amendments is the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. Administration spokesmen like Secretary of State Dulles and Attorney-General Brownell also oppose the amendments.

Briefly, the treaty power arises from sections of the Constitution which empower the President, with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senators present, to enter into treaties which are then the supreme law of the land.

THE FOUNDING CONCEPT

When the treaty power was embodied in the Constitution, its purpose was to assure other nations that the new Republic, composed of a number of States with different laws, would act as a unit under a treaty. It was simply to say that the President and the Senate could act for all of the States and that all were agreed that no State could act alone in international concerns.

At that time the accepted area for treaties lay in the international field alone. In fact, the framers of the Constitution made it plain that the treaty power, in their view, was a device for international relations and was properly used only in foreign affairs. In

the Federalist (paper 57), Alexander Hamilton expressed the view of the drafters when he wrote: "The power of making treaties relates neither to the execution of subsisting laws nor to the enaction of new ones. * * * Its objects are contracts with foreign nations, which have the force of law but derive it from the obligations of good faith. They are not rules prescribed by the sovereign to the subject, but agreements between sovereign and sovereign."

But that, as Mr. Justice Holmes wrote in 1920 in Missouri against Holland, was a long time ago. It was this decision which brought to flower the philosophy that a treaty can do things the Congress cannot constitutionally do.

This is what happened: The Congress passed a law regulating the taking of migratory birds. Two Federal courts declared the law unconstitutional, saying that it did not come within the delegated powers of the Congress. Later, in 1916, a treaty was ratified with Great Britain on the subject, and that treaty provided for implementing legislation. Thereupon the Congress passed a statute nearly identical with the first, and the Supreme Court upheld the law as valid implementation of a valid treaty.

Thus the device of a treaty allowed the Congress to override the 10th amendment to the Bill of Rights. If a treaty can override one part of the Constitution, cannot another treaty override another part, such as the first amendment, which contains express prohibitions against legislation in the field of a free press, free speech, religious freedom, the right of assembly, and the right of petition?

RATIFIED BY ONE SENATOR

Opponents of the proposed amendments say no. They say that in Asakura against Seattle the Court held that the treaty-making power "does not extend as far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids."

But those who want the power of treaties defined argue that decision proves their point exactly. They say that the Constitution forbids the Congress to enact such laws, but the prohibition applies only to the Congress. There is no similar prohibition placed upon the President and the Senate in the making of treaties. There is no express limit to the treaty power. And they say there must be one.

Opponents of the limitation say this isn't necessary because the Senate can be depended upon to guard those rights and not to ratify a treaty which can injure them, and they point to the fact that since a two-thirds vote of those Senators present is needed to ratify that this provides a safety in numbers.

But this was not the case on January 29, 1952, when only six Senators were on the floor as the protocol for the admission of Greece and Turkey to the North Atlantic Treaty was first agreed upon. Nor was that the case in the ratification of the treaty with Ireland. When it was brought up on June 13, 1952, Senator SPARKMAN was in the chair and only Senator THYE, of Minesota, was in the Chamber. Senator SPARKMAN called for the ayes and nays and declared the treaty ratified. Senator THYE told the Washington Star later that he did not vote for the treaty, but that he did not object. Thus Senator SPARKMAN seemes to have ratified a treaty all by himself.

It is because of instances like this that 64 Senators are willing to put a safer guard on both treaties and themselves. A two-thirds vote, they know, isn't much of a safety valve when only one Senator can ratify a treaty.

But this isn't the only reason, or even the main reason, for the desire of these Senators to amend the Constitution. They are aware that in recent years there has been a growing movement to do through the treaty power what the Congress itself cannot do. They know that there are a number of treaties, either completed or in process of completion, in the United Nations which would invade domestic law, upset the historic balance of the executive, legislative, and the judicial branches and which could reduce the powers of the States while increasing the powers of the Federal Government.

WHAT THE U. N. PROPOSES

What the United Nations proposes in the way of world jurisdiction over matters heretofore within the domestic area was clearly set forth in the January 1948 issue of The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, by John P. Humphrey, former director of the Division of Human Rights of the U. N.

Mr. Humphrey wrote: "What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationships between the states and individuals, and therefore a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of states. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supranational supervision of this relationship between the state and its citizens."

The State Department under the last administration went along with this proposal. In September 1950 the State Department issued its Foreign Affairs Policy Series 26, and the policy set forth was that there is no longer any real distinction between domestic and foreign affairs.

That this thinking on the relationship between domestic and foreign affairs has not been restricted to the State Department is evidenced in the dissenting opinion of Chief Justice Vinson in the steel seizure case.

Despite the express constitutional prohibition against seizure of private property the Chief Justice relied first upon our adherence to the United Nations Charter to maintain for the President a power to seize the steel mills. He pointed out that the first purpose of the United Nations is "to maintain international peace and security, and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace." He added that the U. N. Charter had been ratified as a treaty by a Senate vote of 89 to 2. Because of this, and subsequent treaties such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, he concluded "our treaties represent not merely legal obligations but show congressional recognition that mutual security for the free world is the best security against the threat of aggression on a global scale." It was only a step or so more to decide that because of all this the President had extraordinary and inherent power to seize property even though the Constitution denied expressly that power.

ADVANCEMENT OF EXECUTIVE POWER

Add to this growing philosophy of executive power such court rulings as U. S. against Reed, when the Court said: "It is doubtful if the courts have power to declare the plain terms of a treaty unenforceable * * *"; and that of U. S. against Thompson: "The power to make treaties has been frequently before the Supreme Court, and there is not a single instance in which a treaty has been declared unconstitutional." Thus, it is not difficult to follow the reasoning of those who fear an abuse of the power of treaties.

Proponents of the amendment say that it will not injure this Nation in its conduct of foreign affairs. With the possible exception of France and Mexico, the United States is said to be the only country where mere ratification of a treaty makes that treaty and all of its provisions the supreme law of the land. Such is not the case in the United Kingdom or Canada, for example. This was pointed out in the Arrow River case, when a Canadian court held: "Without the sanction of Parliament, the Crown cannot alter an existing law by entering into a contract with a foreign power." It also held that the terms of a treaty are not enforceable unless the "treaty has been implemented or sanctioned by legislation rendering it binding upon the subject."

That is just about what the proponents of a limitation on the powers of treaties would like to have. They want to limit treaties to the concept of the founders: that they are a device for agreements between nations and not a vehicle for domestic law which, under reckless guidance, can run the wrong way.

Nobody Knows Where the Boundaries of the United States Lie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1953

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I believe the article and the letter speak for themselves:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 26, 1953]

NOBODY KNOWS WHERE THE BOUNDARIES OF THE UNITED STATES LIE

(By Richard Fryklund)

Congressmen debating the Hawaii statehood and tidelands oil bills have discovered no one really knows where the boundaries of the United States lie.

What is more, no one knows how to find out.

The problem is not an idle one. Ownership of countless millions of dollars worth of oil and other minerals depends on the precise location of the Nation's coastal boundaries. Until the lines are drawn many other questions must remain unanswered:

Who may supervise valuable offshore fisheries? How close to our shores may a foreign warship sail? How far out do our coastal defenses extend? Where can we stop smugglers of narcotics, aliens, and liquor? What are our own rights in foreign waters?

Detailed answers do not exist. Nor is it known who should find the answer or how the proper party—whoever that may be—should go about finding it.

NOT VITAL, SO FAR

The Nation has been able to rock along for 177 years with only rough estimates of the location of the seaward borders simply because the estimates have not been challenged. But passage of the tidelands bill will make it necessary to measure the United States down to the last square foot. Drillers will have to know who has jurisdiction over the undersea gushers they bring in.

Approval of Hawaii statehood will bring up this question: How is the 49th State to be defined geographically? Where will the boundaries be drawn in the case of a State consisting of 21 islands and numerous rocks and shoals stretching 1,910 miles across the Pacific?

The Hawaiians themselves do not particularly care, as long as the eight inhabited islands are included. The rest are of no use, and offshore undersea lands, are worthless volcanic ash.

According to law, the United States border at the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf is the low-tide mark along shore, except in the case of some bays, estuaries and other pieces of water which are considered inland even though salty. Stretching 3 miles out from the low-tide mark or from the outer limit

of the bays is a marginal belt called "territorial waters" over which the United States has complete control and jurisdiction. Title to this belt would be given to the coastal States under the tidelands bill. There is an additional belt of 9 miles claimed for customs purposes.

BUT WHERE'S LOW TIDE?

But the catch to all this is that the lines of low tide and the outer limits of the inland bays have never been located. Until that line has been drawn, the 3- and 12-mile limits cannot be defined.

The technique for drawing the first line has been debated for many years. For instance, should the low-tide mark be taken to mean the lowest tide recorded or the average of the annual lowest tides or just the average low tide? The difference between the three could be measured in hundreds of square miles. Where, exactly, is the mouth of a bay? Which bays should be considered inland? How deep must a dimple in the coast be before it can be called a bay? What do you do about islands—and the bits of land that build up and then wash away?

FOUR METHODS

Four methods of fixing our boundaries have been advanced:

1. Ignore bays, fix the line along any low-tide mark, and draw the 3-mile and 12-mile limits to parallel the shoreline. The outer limits would have bays and capes the exact size and shape as the real ones on the coast.

2. Count any indentation less than 10 miles across as a bay. Stipulate that the shore and the lines drawn across the mouths of bays shall be the boundaries.

3. Count only deep indentations as bays, using an arbitrary formula to decide which is deep enough in proportion to the width of its mouth. Fix the 3- and 12-mile limits by drawing arcs of circles with 3- and 12-mile radii from every point along the shore. (That would smooth the outer lines and make them easier for a ship navigator to calculate.) Each island would have its own inland border and its own 3- and 12-mile limits.

4. Draw straight lines between projecting points along the coast, and count all ocean, rocks, islands, and bays behind the lines as inland territory. The 3- and 12-mile limits also would be straight lines.

ALL ARE PROPER

Apparently any of these methods would be proper under international law. The straight line method (No. 4) is the most generous. It was approved recently by the International Court of Justice at The Hague. The Court did not even put a limit on the length of the straight lines. If there actually is no limit, the United States could claim almost half of the Gulf of Mexico as inland waters by drawing a line from Key West to the tip of Texas.

The other three methods would give the United States less area and create more technical difficulties.

The executive branch has usually favored method No. 3, the most conservative and most difficult (except for No. 1, which is impossible from a practical standpoint). It has the advantage, however, of covering all possible contingencies.

But even before a method can be adopted, it must be decided whether the power to fix the boundaries lies with the President, Congress, or the courts.

WHO DECIDES?

If fixing the boundary involves acquisition or relinquishment of territory for the United States, then Congress, under the Constitution, would have the say. Obviously territory would be added or subtracted depending on where the final line is drawn.

Or, if fixing the boundary involves international relations, the President, under the Constitution, would make the decision. Clearly the location of the boundary and the shape of the 3- and 12-mile limits are part and parcel of foreign affairs.

Or, if fixing the boundary is a matter for dispute between the Federal Government and the coastal States, the Supreme Court, under the Constitution, would be the arbiter. Already the Justice Department has filed suit against California in an attempt to settle the status of five indentations claimed by the State as inland bays.

One tentative move has been made toward settling the jurisdictional dispute. A special master, appointed by the Supreme Court to listen to the case of the *United States* v. *California* apparently concluded that the President—speaking through the Attorney General—should draw the line and that that line should be confirmed without change by the Supreme Court. The high court's final word on the California dispute is expected later this year.

But the California case was filed by the Truman administration. Attorney General Brownell indicated during a recent hearing on tidelands that the Eisenhower administration may take a different view. Mr. Brownell asked Congress to draw the line marking the 3-mile limit, putting it on an actual map and attaching it to the tidelands bill. His suggestion was ignored, however. Lawmakers said privately that they were having enough trouble passing a tidelands bill without adding the inconceivably difficult job of surveying the Nation's coastline.

Congress has not expressed an opinion on jurisdiction. A House subcommittee set out to solve the puzzle last year, but after spending its money on numerous hearings, the group decided the problem was just too complex. The final subcommittee report raised a multitude of questions but attempted to answer none.

FREEDOM OF SEAS

The ultimate size of the United States will depend in part on who wins the jurisdictional quarrel. Under both Democratic and Republican administrations, the executive has been conservative in its claims. The recommended border usually has been as close as practicable to the actual coast line. Uncle Sam has always stood for freedom of the seas both at home and abroad, and a tightly drawn line would promote that principle.

But many Congressmen back the theory: The bigger the better. The United States should claim as much of the ocean bed as possible as inland waters, they believe.

The coastal States, of course, want all they can get. The States now control their inland waters, and under the tidelands bill they would own everything seaward to the 3-mile limit. Revenue from oil leases obviously would vary with the location of the State's boundaries.

At any rate, a problem that has been postponed for 177 years will have to be solved once and for all the first time an oil well roughly 3 miles from shore begins to gush.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1953.

Mr. B. M. MCKELWAY,
Editor, Sunday Star,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCKELWAY: Richard Fryklund wrote at length in your issue of Sunday, April 26, that "nobody knows where the boundaries of the United States lie." Is that so, because those Great Americans who negotiated and wrote the Treaty of Independence with the British Crown in 1783, fixing the boundaries of the Original Thirteen States on the Great Lakes and in the Atlantic Ocean, have long since departed and our present generation of statesmen, politicians, and writers are insufficiently interested or lack the energy to go to the Library of Congress, or any law library, and call for a book of treaties and statutes admitting the various States into the Union since the adoption of the Constitution?

The provision in article 6 of the United States Constitution that all treaties shall be the supreme law of the land was prompted by that very treaty which finally secured to the people of the original States "all claims to the Government, proprietary and territorial rights of the same and every part thereof."

Article 4, section 3 of the United States Constitution provides exclusive authority in the Congress to admit new States into the Union.

Accordingly, Congress has admitted 35 States since adoption of the Constitution in 1789 and, in each case, fixed the boundaries of the respective States, whether these States were inland or coastal States; and these State boundaries are definite and can be located with engineering certainty.

The Treaty of 1848 with Mexico confirmed the seaward boundary of Texas and also fixed California's coastline. The act of Congress admitting California fixed its boundary as 3 miles in the Pacific from said coastline.

Likewise, the acts admitting Oregon and Washington fixed the State boundaries at 3 miles from the coast.

The act of March 3, 1845, admitting Florida as a State, fixed its boundary by reference to the Treaty of 1819 by which Spain ceded Florida to the United States. A little research in the Congressional Library will show that Spain originally held Florida as a territory and ceded the same to the British Crown in February 1763; that, in October of the same year, the British Crown issued a proclamation fixing the Florida seaward boundary; and, in 1783, Britain retroceded the Florida territory to Spain and, in 1819, Spain ceded Florida to the United States with the same seaward boundary.

Boundaries of the other Gulf States were definitely fixed by the acts of Congress admitting them into the Union, in some cases fixing their boundaries from shore and in others from the coast.

There is no mystery about where our coastline, or the line dividing the inland waters from the high seas, lies.

In 1895, Congress enacted 28th United States Statute at Large, page 672, amended in 1946, authorizing the designation by suitable bearings, lighthouse, etc., the line dividing the high seas from rivers, harbors, and inland waters. Under this law, as amended, our coastline has been established and, where a State boundary extends from coast, it is a relatively easy manner, when and as occasion may arise, to measure the boundary distance fixed by the act of Congress from such coastline.

With the law and these authorities available, Mr. Fryklund's statement that "according to law, the United States border in the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf is to the low-tide mark along shore," etc., is evidently an erroneous statement made without reference to our treaties, Constitution, and relevant laws on the subject of State boundaries.

All State coastal boundaries, fixed by treaty and acts of Congress, are their historic boundaries and it is this type of boundary that was recognized in favor of Norway by the International Court of Justice.

So you see, there is no problem about establishing coastal State boundaries, whether in the Great Lakes, Atlantic, Pacific, or Gulf of Mexico.

If nobody knows where these boundaries are, it is because that nobody takes the trouble to sit down a little while in a library and refer to the authorities on the subject.

Let us be mindful of the fact that our Nation and the States which compose it have lawful background and historic tradition in which we should all be proud and support them as good Americans. Whatever the historic boundaries of our coastal States may be as fixed by treaties and acts of Congress, they cannot be changed at this late date

because so-called liberals would restrict our boundaries to a 3-mile belt from shore.

Here is well to ponder the question put by Mr. Fryklund, "How close to our shores may a foreign warship sail?" Well, they may not sail within our territorial waters, or historic coastal boundaries, and submarines of other nations must surface when they enter those historic territorial waters.

And these territorial waters are within our historic boundaries, and not 3 miles from shore. Thank God our forefathers and statesmen, who preceded us, had the vision and courage to establish our historic boundaries as they are set down in these treaties and laws of the United States of America.

Yours very truly,

F. EDW. HÉBERT.

Tuttle Creek Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1953

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter I have received from Mr. James R. Smith, manager of the Missouri River division of the Mississippi Valley Association, calling attention to Tuttle Creek Dam in Kansas:

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1953.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: We who are interested in flood control in the Midwest are deeply concerned by the elimination of the Tuttle Creek Dam from the President's 1954 budget. Because your district includes areas in the Missouri and Mississippi Basin which have historically been subject to flooding, may we direct your attention to the importance of Tuttle Creek Dam in Kansas. That structure is an integral part of the overall flood-control program for the Missouri Basin and is specifically designed to prevent floods originating in Kansas on the Blue River. It was that watershed which caused the disastrous 1951 flood in the Topeka and Kansas City areas.

In Tuttle Creek the only consideration is flood control. There is to be no power, no irrigation. Alternative plans have been checked and double checked for years, and good engineering always returns irrevocably to the Tuttle Creek Dam as a structure necessary to flood prevention downstream. Only a small minority of selfish interests would prefer making the Kansas River a long floodway, pouring excess water on the people downstream rather than impounding it behind Tuttle Creek to be released gradually. The Mississippi Valley Association, representing leaders in the flood-control and natural-resources development field in 23 Midwestern States, has long favored the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam.

We reiterate that position now in an effort to help clarify the real purpose of that structure, its value to citizens and to private and public facilities riparian to the rivers below it, and its utter essentiality to sound flood-control engineering.

The Mississippi Valley Association earnestly solicits your consideration in having continued construction funds restored by Congress.

Very truly yours,

JAMES R. SMITH,
Manager, Missouri River Division,
Mississippi Valley Association.

Speech of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House of Representatives at the Triennial Convention Banquet of B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1953

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is the speech made by the Speaker on the occasion of the triennial convention banquet of B'nai B'rith, the 110-year-old Jewish service organization, held at the Hotel Statler in Washington on May 5, 1953, in the presence of the Vice President of the United States, the Attorney General and Justices of the Supreme Court, and other courts, Members of the House and Senate, other dignitaries and an assemblage of 1,000 delegates to the triennial convention:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, members of the B'nai B'rith organization, it is a real privilege to be here this evening to address a group which has done so much to foster good citizenship, the humanitarian spirit, and a strong America.

When I was first invited to come and talk to you, I had a general idea as to what your organization stood for. I knew that it had done much to bring about greater harmony and understanding among the American people. I knew that it concerned itself with both domestic and foreign affairs. I knew that in your ranks could be found key leaders from virtually all walks of American life.

But, frankly, I had no idea of the wide scope of your activities. That is, I had no idea until I had had a chance to read a little blue-covered booklet entitled "This is B'nai B'rith" and published by your Supreme Lodge.

I was impressed by your Americanism program as outlined in that booklet. I was equally impressed by the humanitarian and charitable spirit you had demonstrated in going to the aid of the homeless people who had been victimized by floods in Canada and in our own Southwest.

But there was one thing I learned from the booklet which impressed me most of all. And that was your emphasis on cooperation with other groups whose immediate aims might not be the specific aims of B'nai B'rith but with whom you could join in meeting the host of common problems which Americans must solve and are solving every day.

This cooperative attitude is one of the pillars of strength upon which our free-enterprise society must depend. If it is to continue to flourish, I, like you, am convinced that it can and will continue to flourish.

Speaking of the cooperative attitude, I encountered it in a most emphatic manner some 16 months ago when I had the good fortune to pay a visit to Israel. For in Israel, cooperation and just plain hard work have been the ingredients of progress.

I saw the people of Israel at work in their new factories and in the fields. I saw a new nation developing through the efforts of people willing and able to work together by the sweat of their brows. I did not see the land of milk and honey, of which the Old Testament speaks. But I did see the possibility that Israel might some day again become such a land.

I might say here that it is my fervent hope that the people of Israel can work out their differences with their Arab neighbors in the not-too-distant future. For the peace and stability of the Middle East are essential if we are to have a genuinely peaceful world.

While near the boundary line between Israel and Jordan I observed soldiers on opposite sides guarding the two frontiers in friendly conversation. I waved my hat, and they all responded. That such a spirit exists provides the basis of eventual peace, and this means so much for the material prosperity of both countries.

While in Israel I had lunch with Mr. Ben-Gurion. Now, I've been in public life for some 40 years. I'm a native-born American. I've traveled widely through this country of ours. I had reason to believe that I knew my country and knew it well.

But do you know something? Ben-Gurion called my attention to some things about America that I just hadn't given much thought to. And I came away with the distinct impression that seeing America through somebody else's eyes can often be a very healthy thing.

I also came away with the feeling that the people of Israel will succeed in building the kind of stable society which is so essential to the preservation of freedom as we know it. And freedom, my friends, is something we can hardly afford to take for granted in a world threatened by Communist imperialism.

I do not need to belabor this audience with details as to the nature of the Communist menace. You know that menace as a total threat to our existence. You know that it has used every conceivable weapon to achieve global domination. You know that the postwar record of the Soviet Union is one which shows a complete disregard for common decencies, treaty obligations, and the kind of diplomatic practice which we have come to expect of civilized governments. The Soviet word has come to be considered valueless.

The attempted subversion of Greece, the blockade of Berlin, the bloody aggression in Korea and Indochina—these are some of the dismal guides to the sort of "peace" policy the Communists have pursued since World War II's end.

You know all of these things and you understand how difficult and how trying is the complex problem they present.

The preservation of our basic freedoms and of our national security demands courage, determination, and the willingness to make sacrifices.

I know that the American people have that courage, that determination, and that willingness to sacrifice; they have demonstrated all three.

The point I am making is that freedom is everybody's business today, and it is certainly the business of Congressmen—of the elected representatives of the people. It is certainly my business in a very direct way.

So I'd like to spend a few minutes this evening talking with you about what I consider to be the requirements of freedom in a dangerous world. Specifically, I would like to pass along some of my ideas as to the requirements we Americans must meet if our Nation is to remain free, and I would like to point up the manner in which the Congress and the administration are working together in facing up to these requirements.

What are the requirements we must meet if we are to remain free? From my point of view, they can be laid down as three types of security—a secure self-confidence, a secure defense, and a secure dollar.

We must have strength enough to deter aggression and, if necessary, to defend ourselves against it. We've got to have a stable domestic economy and we must continue to believe in our ability to have both of these things within the framework of our traditional freedom.

Our belief in the American way of life and in its ability to meet any problems that may arise is the basis of our security. Our republican institutions have been the inspiration for our greatness. They can and will be the inspiration for an even greater future.

Juridical Status of the Continental Shelf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1953

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, Congress is now called upon to provide for control and development of the resources of the Continental Shelf. To help us get a clear understanding of the legal basis for legislation affecting this offshore area, I should like to include in our record an important statement by the distinguished authority on international law, Dr. Joseph Walter Bingham, of Stanford University.

The statement follows:

JURIDICAL STATUS OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

(By Joseph Walter Bingham)

(Presented to the seventh conference of the Inter-American Bar Association at Montevideo November-December 1951, on behalf of the State Bar of California.)

The development of modern international law has been characterized continuously by conflicts over uses and resources of the seas. In the history of diplomacy and in juristic writings there are no more hotly debated doctrines than those of freedom of the sea and its limitations in peace and in war. Today again among professional scholars, debates grow warm over a new and pressing practical problem within the scope of a general topic of the old commentaries—jurisdiction over the seabed and its subsoil. The discovery of oil deposits in Continental Shelves and similar sea-covered continental areas in various parts of the world has heightened appreciation of mineral resources of the seabed off the coasts of ocean-bounded countries and of the importance of governmental controls over their development. A series of precautionary assertions of jurisdiction by coastal States has resulted recently and has set off a continuous chain of professional comments and criticisms. In 1950, the problem of jurisdiction over continental shelves was discussed at conferences of the International Bar Association in London, of the Institut de Droit International in Bath, of the International Law Association in Copenhagen, and of the International Law Commission of the United Nations in Geneva. A number of addresses and of articles in periodicals have carried on the debates. In some of these articles counsel on a pressing practical problem has been darkened by a display of traditional dogmas which are befogging hindrances to realistic decisions.

The series of governmental claims was started by the United Kingdom with a treaty between it and Venezuela, February 26, 1942, concerning the submarine areas of the Gulf of Paria and by the United Kingdom's annexation of some of these areas on August 6, 1942; but the effective spark for the critical comments was struck by President Truman's two proclamations of September 28, 1945—one extending the jurisdiction of the United States in protection of its coastal fisheries over high sea zones (beyond territorial waters) to be later defined, and the other asserting jurisdiction over the natural resources of Continental Shelves of the United States beyond territorial waters. Political pressures for these proclamations began years before the British treaty with Venezuela and they were issued only after a long period of controversial opposition by most interested international lawyers of the United States and by those Americans who were more concerned with fishing off foreign coasts than with domestic coastal fisheries.

The political pressures for the Proclamations arose from events of the early 1930's—the invasion of the salmon fishery of Bristol Bay, Alaska, by Japanese vessels and a concurrent officially sponsored Japanese proposition that the exploitation of all American West Coast fisheries be left exclusively to the Japanese with Americans and Canadians furnishing part of the capital and sharing the profits. The proposition was accompanied by a bland suggestion that if it was refused, Japanese vessels could take a major part of the catch anyway outside territorial waters and that under American, Japanese, and British traditional diplomatic doctrines, this could not be prevented legally. This threat of destruction of one of the most valuable coastal fisheries in the world by overfishing in defiance of Canadian and American conservation regulations aroused employers and employees of the west coast fishing industry to organized protests. Longshoremen, through their unions, added their voices to the demand for governmental action to keep Japanese vessels from fishing off the Pacific coasts of the United States and Canada.

Although the Japanese Government, under pressure from the American Department of State, agreed to forbid Japanese vessels to fish for salmon off American and Canadian coasts, it expressly reserved its claim of right to participate in these fisheries and thus signified that its banning order was temporary and revocable. Obviously there could be no permanent protection of these fisheries against damaging foreign invasions except through a reversal of the persistent diplomatic practice of the United States and Canada for over a hundred years past, limiting coastal State jurisdiction over fisheries to territorial waters, as defined by the Anglo-American 3-mile doctrine. This revolutionary step was taken finally by President Truman in 1945.

I relate these facts concerning President Truman's fishery proclamation because the Continental Shelf proclamation was a result of similar domestic economic and political pressures and has the same broad legal basis, and because separate pressures for the proclamations were unified early in the course of the debates.

Although the two proclamations can be distinguished in technical legal particulars, in fundamental bases they are alike, are susceptible to similar traditional doctrinal objections and in justice and logic should stand or fall together. Each is designed to protect against damaging foreign invasions offshore extraterritorial resources which are connected with similar coastal territorial interests, in natural fact and in the minds of the coastal population.

Attempts of certain American lawyers, Government employees, and business interests to confine the fishery proclamation to conservation and to deny United States extraterritorial proprietary claims to its coastal fisheries are unsound legally and are unwise. Without extraterritorial proprietary interest in the Bristol Bay fishery, the United States would have no independent right of conservation control of the extraterritorial use of this fishery by foreign ships. In support of its claim to such extraterritorial proprietary interest and consequent independent control, the United States could marshal more precedential constant claims of other States, from earlier centuries to the present, and a stronger display of technical arguments than can be mustered in support of the legal validity of the Continental Shelf proclamation. Therefore, those Americans who seek to weaken the fishery proclamation are also undermining the shelf proclamation and its protection of United States claims to oil deposits valuable for military defense. Military defense is connected importantly with United States control of Alaskan fisheries also and was a decisive element in the fight for the proclamations, a fact of which opponents, in and out of the Government, seem blissfully unaware.

There is another assimilating element in the two proclamations which is concealed by the wording of the fishery proclamation. Although there is a different definition of extraterritorial areas of control in the fishery proclamation, in practice probably it will be found expedient to confine the areas of control to waters over the Continental Shelf and similar offshore banks, which are the main commercial coastal fishing grounds. Extension of coastal State jurisdiction over fisheries to the edge of the Continental Shelf is not a new idea. At a fisheries conference in Madrid in 1916, de Bruen, of Spain, proposed such an extension in the interest of conservation because edible fish were found over the Continental Shelf in largest quantities for commercial purposes. Two eminent Argentine lawyers, Suarez and Storni, also advocated vigorously the Continental Shelf doctrine more then a quarter of a century ago, and in the course of the contest for the Truman proclamation, the Continental Shelf was suggested as the appropriate limit for extraterritorial control of coastal fisheries. Probably the Truman fishery proclamation did not adopt expressly the Continental Shelf limit because its drafters desired to include in its protective scope historic fishing banks off the Atlantic Coast. Recent developments in fishing technique, including use of airplanes to spot shoals of fish, have made it possible to catch in the deep sea commercial quantities of fish previously available only in shallow coastal waters and over banks, but it is doubtful that coastal State jurisdiction over deep-sea extraterritorial fishing can be justified to the common sense of the international community. Therefore, I do not expect to see the authority of the Truman fishery proclamation asserted beyond the shallow waters of the Continental Shelf and banks.

To clarify the minds of those Americans who oppose the Truman fishery proclamation because of their interest in fishing off Latin American coasts, it should be stated emphatically that the proclamation proposes nothing which can justify foreign governmental interference with legitimate American deep-sea fishing off foreign coasts. Its purpose is to protect true coastal fisheries only and those fish which traditionally have been caught in commercial quantities only in shallow offshore waters over the Continental Shelf or banks. It does not purport to monopolize or control any deep-sea fishing beyond territorial waters nor to cover on the high seas species of fish which are caught principally in deep-sea waters. For instance, deep-sea tuna fishing is beyond its scope. On the other hand, the proclamation does justify similar jurisdictions of foreign states over their coastal fisheries in accord with professional opinions during the past century of scientific authorities and British parliamentary committees concerning the problem of conservation of the North Sea fisheries. This is in accord also with the desires of the majority of coastal states, especially the smaller states whose fisheries are an important factor in the national economy and a main food resource for their peoples.

We live in a revolutionary age when the peace and welfare of the world urgently demand in international affairs cooperation and just recognition of the interests of small states as well as large, and a diminution of the traditional influences of the strong hand and politically powerful assertions of private aggrandizement against the important interests of small states and peoples. Therefore, piratical invasions of coastal fisheries by large foreign organizations, resentful of any control over their destructive methods and careless of the damage they cause to important seafood resources of coastal peoples as they move from depleted fishing grounds to exploitation of others, should be opposed by public opinion and by law. Licensed and

controlled coastal fishing and amicable agreements between states interested in a particular fishery are the only promising avenue to early conservation of coastal fisheries. The best paving of this avenue is international recognition of a sufficiently broad jurisdiction of coastal states over their fisheries. Global international regulation is a long, rough road ahead.

After the Truman proclamations, the series of governmental assertions of jurisdiction continued with decrees, proclamations, or legislation by Argentina (January and October 1944); Mexico (October 29, 1945, and February 25, 1949); Chile (July 23, 1947); Peru (August 1, 1947); Nicaragua (art. 2, constitution, January 22, 1948); Costa Rica (July 27, 1948, and November 2, 1949); Saudi Arabia (May 28, 1949); Iran (May 19, 1949); Quatar (June 8, 1949); Trucial Coast; Kuwait (June 12, 1949); Bahrein; United Kingdom extension of territory of Bahamas to cover its Continental Shelf beyond territorial waters, but not the waters over the added part of the shelf (Order in Council 1948); similar Orders in Council for Jamaica (1948), British Honduras (1950), Farkland Islands (1950).

There is a wide range of differences in the scopes of these various governmental acts. Some of them cover only the Continental Shelf and its natural resources; some include fisheries and extensive water areas. It is not a purpose of this paper to discuss these differences in detail nor to criticize technically any of the claims. In passing, however, I venture to comment that some of them certainly are excessive and infringe too far with insufficient reasons on the traditional doctrine of freedom of the seas to receive wide support from other states, from judicial tribunals, or from unprejudiced professional opinions. I purpose only to speak briefly in support of the basic theses underlying President Truman's Continental Shelf proclamation.

The official reasons for the proclamation are stated in it. I therefore quote it in full:

"Whereas the Government of the United States of America aware of the long-range, worldwide need for new sources of petroleum and other minerals, holds the view that efforts to discover and make available new supplies of these resources should be encouraged; and

"Whereas its competent experts are of the opinion that such resources underlie many parts of the Continental Shelf off the coasts of the United States of America, and that with modern technological progress their utilization is already practicable, or will become so at an early date; and

"Whereas recognized jurisdiction over these resources is required in the interest of their conservation and prudent utilization when and as development is undertaken; and

"Whereas it is the view of the Government of the United States of America that the exercise of jurisdiction over the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf by the contiguous nation is reasonable and just, since the effectiveness of measures to utilize or conserve these resources would be contingent upon cooperation and protection from the shore, since the Continental Shelf may be regarded as an extension of the land mass of the coastal nation and thus naturally appurtenant to it, since these resources frequently form a seaward extension of a pool or deposit lying within the territory, and since self-protection compels the coastal nation to keep close watch over activities off its shores which are of the nature necessary for the utilization of these resources.

"Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the following policy of the United States of America with respect to the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf.

"Having concern for the urgency of conserving and prudently utilizing its natural resources, the Government of the United States of America regards the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf beneath the high seas, but contiguous to the coasts of the United States as appertaining to the United States, subject to its jurisdiction and control.

"In cases where the Continental Shelf extends to the shores of another State, or is shared with an adjacent State, the boundary shall be determined by the United States and the State concerned in accordance with equitable principles.

"The character as high seas of the waters above the Continental Shelf and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation are in no way thus affected."

In the development of all governments and all laws there are evident two prime influences. There is (1) the influence of common predominant social beliefs and of the active political and social pressures of powerful special interests, and there is (2) the influence of professional lawyers—the organizers and formulists of legal thought-advocates, judges, and jurists. The first of these two influences is the more fundamental, of course, but in our professional zeal often we tend to overemphasize the second and sometimes in our debates we almost ignore the first as a potent factor. A similar tendency is observable in political controversies, where commonly very prejudiced interests are camouflaged by persuasive generalities and slogans. Indeed it is a familiar tenet of lawyers, not only those who make no pretense to intensive learning, but some jurists of high intelligence, that there are definitive principles of justice, established in tradition, existing independently of particular contending forces, economic, political and social, and that by a resort to these principles, impartial arbiters may resolve all legal controversies without prejudice. Conflicting economic and social pressures are not supposed to affect law except through deliberative legislation. This tenet seems to me an illusion with mischievous possibilities. I challenge any honest, competent student of the history of municipal law to declare that it is not characterized by judgments unjust to important human interests, by constant selfish influences, by anachronisms, and by social consequences that cannot be approved. Let me instance at random the old law of married women's rights, of illegitimacy, of slavery, and of labor relations and the stubborn, intolerant opposition to reforms which has appalled humane students of morals.

Do not mistake these statements for an attack on the integrity and ability of our profession, for which I have a great respect. My purpose is only to emphasize that law is not and cannot be a product of impartial devotion to justice alone, but in very large measure is determined by very human and very selfish political, economic, and social influences. The forces of prejudice and selfishness can influence law without affecting the common honesty or conscientious devotion to duty of members of our profession and other public servants. As students of government we cannot ignore these potent factors of legal and governmental evolution which thus far in history always have functioned almost universally. In the field of international relations, this fundamental truth of all government and all law is especially evident, and the tragic state of the world is forcing intelligent statemen to a realistic appreciation of it.

In my Report on the International Law of Pacific Coastal Fisheries, I traced briefly the history of British diplomatic practice concerning jurisdiction over sea fisheries from the time of Elizabeth to the present and thus illustrated by the radical shifts of English legal claims, twice utterly reversing a basic international policy of the government in response to current economic and political pressures, this important fact that national interests dictate national legal doctrines and that international law is affected accordingly. How much of the sea law of belligerent and neutral rights was due to the influence of England and of the United States in pursuit of their interests? How many of the important changes in this law from time to time have been due to current pressures of these great naval powers? How much of the widespread propaganda for the 3-mile limit on coastal state jurisdiction in peacetime and the fixed obsession of many lawyers that the doctrine represents international law has been due to the diplomatic practice of these and other great naval and commercial powers in accord with their domestic, economic, and political pressures? Why did the Conference of State Delegates at The Hague in 1930, called under the auspices of the League of Nations to codify three topics of international law chosen by experts as "ripest for codification," fail to accomplish a major part of its program? Territorial waters was one of the topics. The powerful advocates of the Anglo-American 3-mile limit doctrine found that the firmly asserted opposing interests of the majority of coastal States, especially the smaller States with coastal fisheries very important to their national economies, was a barrier to codification of that doctrine, and four of the five principal advocates of the doctrine, England and the United States, Germany and Japan, were unable to compromise sufficiently because of traditional domestic political pressures.

This is not an argument for cynical abandonment of efforts for stable and certain law and order, nor for desertion of idealism and devotion to selfish aggrandizement. It is only a suggestion of the need for a realistic science of law and of its value as a basis for professional efforts. It is useless to condemn self-interest. It is useless also to attempt to found an international order and law which shall function in impartial divorcement from the influence of particular national and private group interests. The hope of platonic intellectuals for a world regulated by law in the interests of abstract justice and the welfare of humanity must remain indefinitely an unrealized and academic ideal. Indeed what is justice? Yet the ideal is important as a stimulus to efforts for improvement of human relations and a curb against abandonment to cynical selfishness. In a realistic appraisal of international affairs, the important peculiar interests of particular peoples must be recognized and given proper weight. No international law can be stabilized for long which insists on categorical rules to the detriment of the just, social, and economic claims of particular peoples. If the people affected are strong enough, they will force legal recognition of their claims. If they are not powerful enough politically to do this, there may result a defect in the legal structure which continually threatens it with rot and destruction.

International law, as well as municipal law, in important particulars, never has been impartially just and never has been stable. In such particulars it always has been and always will be a product of the interplay of national and private group interests, prejudices, and pressures, and therefore it has been unstable, uncertain, and controversial. The path of international law and of the orderly peaceful adjustment of controversies never will be smooth until there is constant mutual recognition of conflicting interests and persistent, reciprocating efforts to reconcile them in the spirit of fair play and for the common welfare of peoples.

I have mentioned incidentally the influence on international law of private group interests with political influence and thus I have touched upon another interesting point about international policies and international law, which also applies more obviously to municipal law. To a very large

extent, international policies and international law are determined or affected by the pressures of provincial and group interests, especially economic interests, with strong influence in domestic politics. Indeed, I have proposed several times, in speech and writing, the thesis that international affairs are chiefly a byproduct of domestic, political, and social pressures. Many illustrations of this thesis doubtless will occur to all thoughtful lawyers with a flair for politics. Within the field of our present discussion, the Truman proclamations, may be mentioned the potent influences on the development of the 3-mile doctrine in the diplomatic practice and law of the United States, of New England fishing and maritime interests, and in the diplomatic practice of England, of the Grimbsy trawlers. The influence of English fishing interests has been sufficient to maintain vigorous British assertion of the 3-mile doctrine against foreign coastal fishery jurisdictions, although it is quite opposed to important interests of the British Commonwealth of Nations, e. g., Canadian, Australian, East Indian, Scotch, and South African interests. The doctrine is opposed also to the weight of opinion of English and continental European experts and to reports of parliamentary committees on the North Sea problem, and it has placed England in the position of using her naval power and great prestige to impose a doctrine of international law which justifies destructive aggressions on the economic resources of weaker coastal states and threatens progressive antisocial ruination of some of the best fisheries of the world. Portugal, Iceland, Norway, and Russia have experienced these English pressures in the past. Norway has resisted England's efforts to induce her to adopt the doctrine and subscribe to the North Sea Convention. In a pending suit in the World Court, England versus Norway, England now seeks to restrict the seaward extent of Norway's protective jurisdiction over her coastal fisheries.

Such international conduct is by no means peculiar to England. It is merely an English expression of quite common political motivations. The United States, under similiar political pressures, has been guilty of advocacy of similar undemocratic, aggressive doctrines in the past, and the suspicion and dislike which other peoples have demonstrated against us were not unearned.

I do not wish to enlarge on this theme. I venture, however, to drop this suggestion. No enduring peace, except a Roman peace (if one may call that peace), is possible in the world until we have a commonly accepted international law which is thoroughly democratic, and this means fair to small peoples as well as large. In the range of our topic it means legal recognition of the superior interests of coastal States, small and large, in their offshore resources—especially fishery and mineral—and in the efficient offshore protection of their domestic economies, law, and peace. There is no hopeful prospect of early accomplishment of this by international legislation, through global treaties or through the United Nations; but through diplomacy, wisely directed, early and continual progress may be made—by firm insistence on fair claims until concordance or acquiescence is won, and through reciprocal recognition of the fair claims of other states. Most of the development of international law since Grotius has been through independent state practice and diplomacy and not through multilateral treaty promulgation. Indeed, the mare liberum of Grotius was a prejudiced advocate's brief in support of Dutch national interests. How has a similar continuing process of modification now become improper?

Now I reach the final phase of my discussion—the influence on international law, and, in particular, on the Continental Shelf problem, of professional juristic opinion. We advocates of the legality of President Truman's Continental Shelf proclamation have little doubt of the ultimate legal decision. No state has protested the proclamation. Great Britain has taken decisive official action in substantial accord with the principle of the proclamation and has influenced various Arabic sovereigns of the Middle East to do likewise. Many states of Central and South America have indicated approval by official acts which go further than the American proclamation. Approval has been indicated by legal advisers of the large oil interests of the world, by French jurists (although some French jurists have expressed opposition), by Dutch lawyers, by committees of the International Law Association and its American branch, by a French committee of the International Law Association, and by the majority of the experts of the International Law Commission of the United Nations. Indeed, the United Nations Commission's tentative conclusions, in concordance with those of a French committee of lawyers, would go further than the Truman proclamation. They would extend a coastal state's jurisdiction over mineral resources of the seabed and subsoil probably to the edge of the Continental Shelf and farther where the shelf is lacking or narrow. The French committee suggested a minimum distance of 20 miles from shore. Since all states which have expressed an opinion by action and all pertinent commercial and financial interests are united in support of this particular extension of coastal state jurisdiction, and there has been no official or political opposition to it, it seems sound to assert that this new development in state practice has been accepted generally and therefore already has become international law. But against this conclusion there have been raised the voices of some European jurists and these opposing juristic opinions induced the 1950 Copenhagen Conference of the International Law Association to postpone endorsement of its committee's report in favor of the principle of the proclamation. The report was referred to the committee for further consideration.

In view of the existing concord of state practice and political and professional approval, why should any jurist insist that the Continental Shelf proclamation is opposed to international law? What are the criteria for determination of international law if state practice is not conclusive? Even those jurists who think that the proclamation is illegal do not deny that the jurisdiction it claims would be beneficial; nor do they offer any better practical device. I doubt that they foresee any diplomatic protest or any legal nullification of the Truman proclamation or of the similar jurisdictional assertions of other states. Apparently their objections are purely doctrinal.

What are these doctrinal objections? They are dogmatic premises which, in modern international law, date from Grotius and his propaganda for freedom of the sea. The jurisdiction asserted by the proclamation, say these juristic critics, infringes on the freedom of the sea and the common rights of the peoples of the world in sea areas.

It should not be forgotten that Grotius was a very practical advocate for Dutch interests and later for Swedish, although he also was a great and sincere proponent of a world order of law and peace. As is the case of most men, especially those whose personal fortunes are involved in politics, his legal views were colored by his prejudices and by the life and circumstances of his age. In his great brief, Mare Liberum, he had two objectives: (1) establishment of freedom of commercial intercourse over the seas against remnants of the extravagant pretensions of Portugal and Spain, and against England's claims of sovereignty over the British seas, and (2) freedom of fishing in the sea. In accordance with the spirit of the age, his argument was predominantly scholastic. On behalf of his second objective, he contended that the open sea was not susceptible of possession and therefore not susceptible of property, and that by the law of nations (by analogy to the ancient Roman law), all the open sea was res communis. Jurisdiction (imperium) over any part of it depended on existing control, as for instance (over persons) through the presence of ships, or (over places) through a commanding fortress. Possession and therefore jurisdiction (imperium) might indeed be obtained over small areas, especially small enclosed areas; but the law of nations did not recognize any property in the open sea even in small areas near the shore, and rightly, because would it not be barbarous for one people to exclude others from resources of the sea which were inexhaustible?

Thus was a doctrinal foundation laid to support the Dutch fishery interests off British coasts. The Dutch indeed relied on treaties also: (1) The Great Intercourse (Intercursus Magnus, 't Groot Commercie-Tractaat, 1496) between Henry VII of England and Philip, Archduke of Austria and Duke of Burgundy, and (2) the treaty of December 15, 1550, between Emperor Charles V and Mary, Queen of Scotland; but they always contended for freedom of fishing independently of treaties, and their operations extended into waters close to shore which the Scotch claimed as territorial and therefore under their exclusive control. The Scotch claims, unlike the English, were not for exclusion of the Dutch from the British seas unless they recognized British jurisdiction by taking out licenses, but for protection of the Scotch coastal fisheries against damaging Dutch invasions. Thus, Welwood, the Scotchman, argued against Grotius for a marginal sea control of fisheries in the interest of conservation and protection of the food supply of the coastal population.

The Scotch claims of exclusive use extended to all the Scotch firths on quasi-prescriptive grounds (Grotius denied the possibility of prescription affecting a res communis, and especially in the law of nations) and to a marginal sea belt of the width of a land's kenning—the farthest distance at sea from which the coast could be seen. This measure, which has been estimated to be about 14 miles (by some 20 miles), was in accord with the ancient customary claims of the Scotch, and indeed had much support in 18th and early 19th century debates and state practice concerning the proper width of marginal territorial seas. It has persisted in Scotch legal argument to recent times. Our present point, however, is that the idea of Welwood finally has prevailed against the foundation dogma of Grotius, because of the political interplay of practical concrete pressures in domestic politics and in international affairs in war and peace. The open sea is susceptible of limited jurisdiction independently of continuing present force and is susceptible of property also.

Quite contrary to the basic scholastic concept of Grotius, sea areas and their products are in their nature as susceptible of proprietary interests as anything else earthly. The only sound criteria of international law concerning the existence of such legal interests are those of expediency—expediency in the cause of the welfare of peoples and of the international community. It has been expedient for States to claim and to recognize in favor of other States various infringements on the sweeping doctrine of Grotius. (See the early arguments of Vattel, book I, ch. XXIII, especially secs. 287–289, and the report of Sir John Fischer

Williams and Prof. George Grafton Wilson to the Institut de Droit International in 1935 on Les Fondements Juridiques de la Conservation des Richesses de la Med.) Modern State practice, for sound, practical reasons, concedes to a coastal State jurisdiction and property in fisheries and other sea and subsea resources and in the soil and subsoil of the sea up to the limit of territorial waters, and in certain cases it has conceded exclusive property in sea uses and riches beyond territorial waters, that is, oyster beds, coral deposits, pearl and chank fisheries, submarine cable uses, extension of subterranean coal mines. It also recognizes a quasi-prescriptive titles in some cases.

The verdict of history and common sense, then, does not give the victory entirely to Mare Liberum in the full sense of Grotius. There is no realistic juristic debate today over monopolistic use and control of commerce on the high seas. It is conceded as settled law that, in general, the high seas are free to all peoples for commerce and travel. This freedom extends even to transit through coastal territorial seas. In general, also, the resources of the high seas are open to exploitation by all peoples and cannot be monopolized. On the other hand, States have sovereign jurisdiction over coastal waters within their territorial limits, and within these limits have proprietary interests in sea and seabed and subsoil and their resources. In practice, State proprietorship and monopolistic control of certain high-sea pearl, chank, and oyster fisheries, based on long usage, has not been seriously contested. The real important, practical contests today are over the width of territorial seas, and over extraterritorial seaward jurisdictional and proprietary claims of coastal States.

The modern juristic formulists who oppose the Truman proclamation with the doctrine of Grotius may be divided into three groups: (1) A few who deny the legality of any extraterritorial proprietary claim to seabed or subsoil; (2) those who outlaw such claims to the seabed but not the subsoil; and (3) those who do not deny the possibility of legal property in bed or subsoil, but insist on occupation as the proper basis of title. My previous discussion will suffice for the first two groups. My remaining comment will be addressed to the argument of the third group. I select for instances the paper read before the Grotius Society on April 5, 1950, by Professor Waldock, Chichele professor of international law and diplomacy of the University of Oxford, on the legal basis of claims to the Continental Shelf, and an article on the Continental Shelf by L. C. Green, published in Current Legal Problems, 1951, under the auspices of the faculty of laws of University College, London. Neither of these gentlemen denies the desirability of coastal State jurisdiction over the oil resources of the Continental Shelf, but they consider that international law requires that extraterritorial proprietorship and jurisdiction must be founded on prior occupation, because of the traditional Grotian premises so far as they have not been invalidated by State practices. Professor Waldock admits that actual occupation of submarine areas is difficult. He leaves uncertain what acts would be sufficient as occupation. Apparently he would consider a declaration such as that of the Truman proclamation to be an initiatory act of occupation if followed in reasonable time by physical acts such as exploration. Would he require the occupational acts to extend to the whole shelf as a requisite of title to the whole? Or would occupation of part under claim to the whole be sufficient?

Both Professor Waldock and Mr. Green think that the British Orders in Council extending the territories of West Indian colonial possessions to include the sea-covered shelves of the islands, follow the occupation doctrine and, therefore, are proper, although both leave open the question of whether the orders in council alone are sufficient legal title in international law. The American method of acquiring jurisdiction over shelf oil they consider technically objectionable.

My opinion of these objections to the Truman proclamation can be deduced from the previous part of this paper. Since through development of State practice from case to case, states have acquired and maintained property and sovereign jurisdiction over coastal marine territorial belts at least 3 miles wide without occupation (although there is no settled common agreement on how wide a belt the law should allow), I am unable to understand why now state practice should not likewise be capable of making legally valid such a limited extension of proprietary interest and jurisdiction as that provided in the Continental Shelf proclamation. Nor do I see any commonsense or barring established principle of State policy or practice which demands that such extensions of jurisdiction must rest on occupation, because other territorial acquisitions dissimilar in particulars, must, for sound reasons of policy, be acquired by title of occupation. If it is agreed that sound statesmanship recognizes that the claim of the proclamation deserves legal support, why should a remnant of an old Grotian dogma bar this desirable result? Are rules and principles in law masters of the minds of jurists and statesmen, or only tools of thought and reason, as in the case of all other branches of practical intelligence? Cannot a jurist arrange his formulas to include this new trend in State practice?

In reality there is nothing in international law up to the present that denies validity to the Truman proclamation. The problem in the case is an entirely new one. It is another development in the long succession of particular problems concerning coastal State jurisdiction over marine areas—a general field which contains many problems not definitely and uniformly settled, as the Codifications Conference at The Hague in 1930 proved. These problems cannot be settled satisfactorily if traditional juristic formulations are considered barriers to realistic solutions. New problems need new thinking, and the law would never have developed to its present viable state if this need had not been met. All broad legal principles are limited in their applicability, and when read abstractly say more than they mean.

Of course, the British annexation of territory method of dealing with the Continental Shelf problem is simple and direct and I see no difficulty about it. Sir Cecil Hurst, in his discussion of the Truman proclamation before the Grotius Society in 1948, did have some doubt about a submarine extension which excluded all space and substance above the seabed. I do not share his doubts. I can see no great difficulty about a submarine extension of territory beyond the 3-mile limit of English tradition. We have something similar in submarine coal mines. The Truman proclamation is more economical in its extension of jurisdiction. It precisely fits the specific needs of the case and no more. It claims no corporeal possessory rights to the sea bed or subsoil beyond territorial waters. Apparently the extraterritorial property rights asserted are incorporeal, of the nature of the profits a prendre of English common law, and the extraterritorial fishery rights implicated in the Truman fishery proclamation are similar. The answer of book-bound jurists might be that such rights in high sea areas are impossible under international law. My answer to that is why? Where lies the determination of international law, with traditional formulas or with State practice? Is it not the function of jurists to renovate and revise their formulas to keep step with the realistic development of state practice? Why should the approved British annexation methods be legitimate and the American method of conscientiously claiming less be illegitimate—in common sense and therefore in law? Remember that the predicated occupation elements must be highly fictional over at least the greater part of the Shelf, if a purpose of the new State practice (orderly control as against acrimonious unregulated competition) is to be accomplished. After the attainment of the modern development of nonoccupied territorial waters against the premises of Grotius, has the system of international law suddenly lost its strength to grow further against juristic dogma to meet the needs of new problems?

The suggestion of Professor Waldock that apparently the Truman proclamation relies on a doctrine of contiguity discredited in past cases of territorial claims is not a just appraisal of the bases of action stated clearly in the proclamation. Contiguity of the extraterritorial parts of the shelves to territory of the United States is only one element in the situation. A most important factor not spelled out in the proclamation is the very human intense belief of coastal populations that such coastal economic resources should belong to them and that unlicensed exploitation by foreigners should not be permitted except where use by foreigners has become habitual and established (an exception provided for in the fishery proclamation). It is on such common natural beliefs and motives that all law and all government are based fundamentally. They are much more important in the causation of law than professional formulations and no abstract a priori doctrine should prevail against them.

I cannot better summarize my basic professional opinion on this important problem than by repeating the concluding paragraph of my editorial comment on the Truman proclamations in volume 40 of the American Journal of International Law at page 178 (January 1946):

"These proclamations, then, are a promising contribution to a better statesmanship which will serve the interests of a world order designed for peace and the mutual cooperation of peoples. They thus will contribute also to development of a democratic international law supporting the just claims of small States, as well as large, and increasing the chances of peace. This democratic law will develop through like frank appraisals of the competitive forces and varying conditions in our world today, instead of through mechanistic adherence to traditional ill-digested generalities and slogans devised by theoreticians of an unscientific age of subsidized piracy, matchlocks, wood fires and candlelight, wide-open spaces, and glorification of cruel aggressive force for selfish profit—theoreticians who could have foreseen little of the technology, industries, social pressures, and dominant impulses of our crowded, complex, modern civilization."

In conclusion, I add the following remark of Sir Cecil Hurst from the closing paragraph of his paper on the Continental Shelf, read before the Grotius Society, December 1, 1948:

"I have indicated many questions which to my mind require examination in connection with this new policy proclaimed in the proclamation of September 1945, but the world wants oil and I think we ought all to approach the study not with the idea of magnifying the objections, but with the intention of finding ways of overcoming the difficulties with which the whole subject is surrounded."

quickly we of the West forget. They look upon peace as an armistice between wars. Peace to them is a time to replan strategy and to study the mistakes both political and military of the last war. We look upon peace as a time of disarmament and a chance to return to a normal way of living.

The Russians have one very simple objective—that is world domination. Since 1938 their progress has been beyond even reasonable dreams and aspirations. There is no good reason, from their viewpoint, why they should give up an inch of land or make any permanent concessions. They can well afford to make a peace in Korea, while stirring up trouble in half a dozen other places.

Part of their strategy is, maybe, to lull us into a sense of false security for a year or so, while they rearm and settle the battle for power within the Kremlin. Or, they may continue their offensives, both political and military, on 3 or 4 fronts.

There are some indications that the Russians and their satellites are steadily gaining on the West in strength and that within a few years they will be able to impose their will on the West. On the other hand, no one knows what real progress is being made in the United States and in England in the development of supersonic ultra-long-range guided missiles, bearing the metropolis-destroying hydrogen bomb.

In any event, the outlook is not at all bright. Western Europe seems to move at snail's pace toward rearmament and unification both of command and of armed forces.

The outlook is dark, not only for the present, but for the future. The Chinese stall us at the truce talks in Korea and we do not dare threaten them with reprisals for death of our men, whom they took prisoner. We cannot balance our budget nor reduce our taxes. Morale is not high among the men in our Armed Forces (if many reports are to be believed).

It may well be that the Russians have taken us further along the road to ruin than we realize.

Stupidity of the Brass Hats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1953

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial from the Portland Oregonian on the subject of the handling of certain of the soldiers recently released from Korea:

STUPIDITY OF THE BRASS HATS

The Armed Forces have been incredibly stupid in their handling of some of the most important aspects of the repatriation of the several score GI's just released from Communist prison camps. The crowning blunder came over the week end with the flight of 20 of the newly freed men to Valley Forge Hospital under conditions that indicated their superiors feared what they might say about Communists or communism.

Before the exchange of prisoners began, Army spokesmen were busy feeding a silly line of propaganda to the American people. We should expect, they cautioned, to find that some of the prisoners had been indoctrinated by their captors, that some had succumbed to the Communist "brain-washing" technique. Then the first stories from Korea were censored, in part it can be assumed to prevent any heretical remarks from reaching the ears of the folks back home. The Valley Forge episode caps the farce. Sunday's psychiatrist-supervised interviews did little to penetrate the military smoke screen.

What a contrast in England. There the returning Tommies were apparently permitted a full measure of the traditional freedom of speech. And many of them had embarrassing things to say: The Reds had treated them fine; it was the Americans they disliked. Britain does not tremble before such talk.

The rest of the world must be amused and amazed at the spectacle of a mighty nation quailing before the imagined horrors of hearing what may be unpatriotic words from the lips of a few soldiers.

Let's have an end of the foolishness before more harm is done. Each of the returning prisoners has lived through an ordeal, some for many long months. Except as limited by the need for medical care, they should be returned speedily to their homes and their families. And there they should have the freedom that all Americans should have, to tell their stories as they want to tell them—even if some among them prove to be confirmed Communist converts.

If communism is such powerful poison that our great land cannot safely absorb a bit of it in the process of welcoming men to whom we owe so much, it is time that we made the discovery.

Crime Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1953

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer an editorial from the May 2 issue of the Shreveport Journal, of Shreveport, La. This editorial points up the increase in crime in the United States:

A SHOCKING REPORT

The Uniform Crime Reports bulletin, recently issued, reveals shocking information about the increase of criminal violations in the United States, with more than 2 million major crimes reported last year. The bulletin is from highest authority, the Federal Bureau of Information, directed by J. Edgar Hoover.

The number of major crimes, estimated in 1952, listed at 2,036,510, represented a gain of 8.2 percent over the record of the year 1951. One of the most shocking disclosures is that violent crimes increased 10.2 percent, which was 2.2 percent higher than the increase in burglaries and thefts.

The rise in criminal acts was not confined to urban areas. Rural sections reported an alarming increase also—both rural and urban crimes were more than 8 percent above the previous year's record.

That the FBI chief considers the crime statistics shocking is indicated by his comment on last year's statistics: "For the first time in 7 years, all classifications of major crime increased in urban areas. Negligent manslaughter, which decreased by 1 percent in rural areas, was the only category of rural crime to decline."

Statistics for the bulletin came from 232 communities with population exceeding 25,000, representing about 15 percent of the Nation's population. These communities reported information from 1,110,675 arrests, with eight times as many males as females placed under arrest. Study of an average group of males and the same number of females revealed a larger percentage of women than men charged with murder, aggravated assault and liquor law violation. The percentage of men was higher than that of women in arrests for robbery, burglary, auto thefts, and drunk driving.

Alarming is the fact that 7.8 percent of those arrested in the United States last year were under the age of 18 years of age, 13.3 percent were under 21, and 23.1 percent were under 25. The youthful criminals, statistics revealed, showed strong inclination for crimes against property, including larceny, robbery, burglary, and auto thefts. Forty-eight percent of persons arrested for such crimes were under 25, many being under 17.

Obviously, law enforcement activities are important in the fight on crimes, but that's by no means all that is necessary. Educational efforts for discouraging unlawful acts need to be increased, and as regards youths, there should be greater emphasis on the rights of others. Not only the home but school and church have responsibility in this direction, but particularly the home. It is due to parental neglect and indifference that many crimes are committed by youths, a shocking situation which the FBI Director himself has repeatedly referred in sounding warnings against the crime's upward trend.

Every good citizen should consider it his or her privilege and duty to help in the discouragement of lawless acts.

President Eisenhower's Approval of Tidelands Grab Would Reverse Position of Great Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1953

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "A Record To Be Proud Of," which appeared in the May 7, 1953, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

A RECORD TO BE PROUD OF

President Eisenhower, on whose desk the offshore-oil giveaway bill will soon arrive, has often expressed pride in the Republican Party's record on conservation. In particular the President has voiced admiration for the contributions of Theodore Roosevelt to conserving our natural resources.

Inevitably this fine Republican record now becomes the background against which President Eisenhower must act on the offshore-oil bill. It is a record whose highlights Post-Dispatch readers will find refreshing and timely.

Actually the record far antedates the Republican Party. Conservation through the device of the public domain started before the birth of present-day political parties. It commences shortly after the Revolutionary War, when the States, at the request of Congress, ceded to the Federal Government all the lands beyond their boundaries to which they had claimed title. The public domain thus came into being.

The Republican Party itself started writing its record for conservation 81 years ago when the first national park, Yellowstone, was established, in 1872, in the administration of Republican President Ulysses S. Grant.

Nineteen years later, in 1891, the first national forests were established, in the administration of Republican President Benjamin Harrison. "This law," writes one historian, "was of vital importance because it stopped for the first time the policy of giving away the public lands and started a trend whereby the public lands were to be retained by the Federal Government for the benefit of the people as a whole."

That piece of history is very much alive today, for President Eisenhower's signature on the offshore-oil bill would reverse that trend.

Republican President William McKinley's administration produced, in 1897, the organic act under which the national forests came to be administered.

But it was Republican President Theodore Roosevelt who brought conservation to its full stature half a century ago. He not only threw himself into the cause with all his famous vigor, but he also interested the States in it through an epochal conference of Governors, such as President Eisenhower has just held at the White House to discuss peace and security.

No one has more nobly expressed the high purpose of the public domain than did Theodore Roosevelt when he established the present Forest Service:

"In the administration of the forest reserves, it must be clearly borne in mind that all land is to be devoted to its most productive use for the most permanent good of the whole of the people, and not for the temporary benefit of individuals or companies.

"Where conflicting interests must be reconciled, the question will always be decided from the standpoint of the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run."

Those words apply to every other national treasure as much as they do to the forests. They apply to minerals, waterways, and range. They apply to the oil lands beneath the seas off our coasts which Congress has just voted in effect to devote to the temporary benefit of individuals or companies.

President Eisenhower need not content himself with merely taking pride in Theodore Roosevelt's record as a conservationist. He can emulate it. And what a record it is.

With the Republican Gifford Pinchot as his right-hand man. Teddy set aside for national forests practically all the forest lands remaining in public ownership, 150 million acres, three times as much as all his predecessors.

He set aside 1½ million acres of land valuable for waterpower sites, 5 million acres of phosphate deposits, 30 million acres of coal lands.

The Reclamation Act was enacted in his administration (1902), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw lands from the public domain for the construction of reclamation works and the establishment of farms to be irrigated.

It was in this act that two stout safeguards of "the greatest good of the greatest number" were set up—safeguards which still stand.

One gives public retail distribution systems first call on federally produced electric power—the so-called preference clause. The other protects the small family-sized farm against being destroyed by factory farming. It sets a limit on the size of tracts which may be irrigated with water from Government projects.

Republican President William Howard Taft's administration produced, in 1911, the law which enabled national forests, up to then limited to the West, to be created in the East as well.

The setting aside of Federal game refuges for migratory birds, in 1927, and regulation of the Federal fisheries, were authorized in the administration of Republican President Calvin Coolidge.

The first major public power and multiple-purpose dam, Hoover, formerly Boulder, was authorized (1928) and put into construction under the administration of Republican President Herbert Hoover.

This is the honorable history of the Republican Party in conservation. It forms the context for whatever President Eisenhower does about the offshore-oil giveaway.

Will the name of Eisenhower go down in history as having carried forward the record of conservation made by Grant, Benjamin Harrison, McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Coolidge, and Hoover?

Or will history say of him that he went against that record and set the trend running the other way?

Broken Promises and Busted Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1953

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald today which reviews our monetary contributions to the so-called foreign aid programs dating back to 1948. It cannot be successfully denied that this editorial is based on fact and not fiction:

BROKEN PROMISES AND BUSTED TAXPAYERS

The President last week asked that foreign aid under the mutual security agency be continued for another year and that $5,800,000,000 be provided for the purpose. It may contribute to understanding of the proposal to identify it by the name it was given when it was originated in 1948 and if the promises made at that time are recalled.

The foreign aid program was given congressional approval as the Marshall plan. The agency which administered it was called the economic cooperation administration. Paul Hoffman was the first head of ECA.

The Marshall plan as it was outlined by Secretary of State Marshall and his friends was a program of specified size and duration. The size was $17 billion and the expiration date was June 30, 1952. These were to be the maximum cost and the extreme date limit. Again and again it was represented that this was to be a one-time operation, that it was not to be repeated nor extended, and would never constitute a precedent for anything like it in the future. Assurances were given that the aid totaling 17 billions could be given without adverse effects upon the United States, or, as stated in that act, without impairing "the economic stability of the United States."

The need for Marshall aid was represented as the consequences of shortage of dollars in European countries, which prevented them from purchasing American products and equipment they need for their economic recovery. The funds we supplied them, President Truman told Congress, would achieve the dual purpose of raising the standard of living in friendly countries and increasing their capacity for production. The funds were to start at the highest level and, as Paul Hoffman put it, "come down every year so that there would not be a shock when the Marshall plan terminated in June 1952."

As June 30, 1952, approached, when ECA was to end according to the unconditional representation made to the American people, signs began to appear that the promise would not be kept. With about a year to go, ECA put out a report of its public advisory board, calling for a broadening of our foreign economic activities. The report declared that ECA can and should push forward on the job ahead, but the 4-year limit on its span of life should be eliminated and its powers appropriately enlarged.

The chairman of the advisory board was William C. Foster, then Administrator of ECA. The other 12 members included Robert H. Hinckley, Utah Democratic politician who held several jobs under Mr. Truman; Jonathan W. Daniels, Truman's biographer and former secretary; James G. Patton, head of the National Farmers' Union, the Truman administration's pet agricultural organization; James B. Carey, the head CIO lobbyist; George Meany, of AFL; and Eric Johnston, a Truman appointee in several capacities.

The Truman administration accepted the findings of this phony board and obtained legislation extending ECA, and changing its name to the Mutual Security Agency. Under the new name, the public was given to think that foreign aid was to be almost exclusively military. In appropriating 6 billions for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, Congress specified that 1 billion was to be for economic aid, 3½ billions for military aid, and one-half billion for military aid which could be transferred to the economic category.

The American people were led to believe that economic aid was about over. The military aid was being given on the theory that Europe was in dire peril. But Europe could not see it that way, and sought to use the whole of the 6 billion for economic items. Washington's resistance was broken down so that wheat, sugar, sulphur, and cotton were classified as defense items.

It is no different in the present fiscal year. Last November, when President Truman's Commerce Secretary headed a commission to investigate foreign aid, it reported back that much of so-called arms aid was in fact economic in character. Defense Secretary Wilson has just reported that $3.8 billion worth of arms will go to Europe during this fiscal year. That represents $3.8 billion of the $5.8 billion that will be spent. A full year after economic aid was supposed to have stopped, it is still being continued at the rate of $2 billion a year.

The solemn obligation was to end Marshall plan aid in 4 years. Mr. Truman made it 5. And now Mr. Eisenhower wants to make it 6. Europe isn't self-supporting after getting the $17 billion, because we wouldn't let her be.

Foreign aid will last forever if people stand for it. When what is now called mutual aid was called lend-lease, it was characterized as follows by Walter Eliot, a member of Parliament, and for many years a prominent figure in the British Government: "It is the most powerful and important economic phrase of our time, the beginning of whose importance we do not see, let alone the end."

If there is any honesty in Government, foreign aid ought to end. Even taking Secretary Wilson's figures, the $5.8 billion request of President Eisenhower ought to be cut by $2 billion. By Marshall test, it ought long since to have gone. He said it would be limited to $17 billion. It already exceeds $25 billion. By test given in the original act, it should end. That test is that it should not impair "the economic stability of the United States."

The net budget deficit since 1948 amounts to $12 billion, despite three tax increases. Foreign aid has impaired our economic stability and is impairing it. Without foreign aid we could have avoided inflation and backbreaking taxation. Without foreign aid in the present fiscal year the budget would be nearly in balance. Cutting out foreign aid in the year ahead would balance the budget after the tax cuts provided in the Reed bill.

systems and methods along sound, intelligent, forward-looking lines, geared to the American way of life.

In so doing, we must not overlook the great value of tradition in making our manpower more effective. Suppose that all of our National Guard organizations had the splendid traditions of the Sumter Guards. Of course, many other units do have distinguished records, and many are earning them even today on the battlefields of Korea. Continued and increased emphasis on splendid traditions, such as these, should do much to improve the future effectiveness and morale and teamwork of both our Reserve and Regular forces.

Founded in the dim past of 1819, your unit was born and dedicated to the worthy cause of our country's best interests. After the adoption of its present name in 1832, it tested its fighting sinews on the plains and crags of Old Mexico. There, it laid a firm foundation for the superb fighting record that was to follow. It then fought with conspicuous gallantry and great distinction and devotion through those dark, dark days of the War Between the States. Growing more mature through service to your State, it again answered the call to Federal duty along the Mexican border in 1916.

The supreme test was then at hand. Into the fiery maw of modern war, your predecessors, and some of you here tonight, plunged at St. Mihiel and went forward gallantly and effectively as part of that great AEF to final victory on the Woevre Plain on that well-remembered 11th day of November of 1918.

Once again a new generation added greatly to the finest fighting traditions of the Sumter Guards on the worldwide battlefields of 1941 to 1945. From Iceland to New Zealand, through Aachen, and over the Rhine, the guardsmen struck like lightning and kept on striking until final victory blessed our arms.

Those very briefly are the outstanding records of the Sumter Guards in war. They are a priceless heritage of the past and a shining inspiration for the future. Your contributions as citizen-soldiers in peace, and your ardent and patriotic devotion to your country at all times and in all places, can never be fully measured in words. In closing, I should like to pay a final tribute to your peacetime heritages and to your great responsibilities and potentialities in this important field in the future. I quote from a portion of a brief but splendid description of our citizen-soldiers:

"Soldier in war, civilian in peace—I am the guard. I was at Johnstown, where the raging waters boomed down the valley. I cradled the crying child in my arms and saw the terror leave her eyes. I moved through smoke and flame at Texas City. The stricken knew the comfort of my skill. I dropped the food that fed the starving beast on the frozen fields of the West, and through the towering drifts I plowed to rescue the marooned. I have faced forward to the tornado, the typhoon, and the horror of the hurricane—these things I know—I was there—I am the guard. I have brought a more abundant, a fuller, a finer life to our youth.

"Wherever a strong arm and valiant spirit must defend the Nation, in peace or war, wherever a child cries, or a woman weeps in time of disaster, there I stand—I am the guard. For three centuries a soldier in war, a civilian in peace—of security and honor, I am the custodian, now and forever—I am the guard."

You are the Sumter Guards. In peace and in war, you have served your country well. May the outstanding heritage of your past continually be augmented by the boundless prospects of your future, solely on fields of peace, we earnestly hope and pray. Should the acid test of war finally come, we know that you will be there, as always, effectively and courageously in the forefront of the defenders of our Nation and of our way of life throughout the world.

Sermon at Funeral of Former Representative William L. Igoe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1953

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon given by his excellency, Archbishop Joseph E. Ritter, at the funeral of the Honorable William L. Igoe, K. S. G., at St. Gabriel's Church in St. Louis, Mo., on April 23, 1953:

Monsignor O'Grady, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities; Monsignor McClafferty, president of the School of Social Work, both of Washington; reverend clergy; officials of the Government, of the State and city; friends, all of you have come to assist Monsignor Butler in the offering of Mass for the repose of the soul of Colonel Igoe and to pay your last respects to his memory.

It was the express wish of Mr. Igoe that at his funeral mass someone speak on death. He did not seek to be eulogized, he did not wish to be praised. Rather, he would have us reflect upon the meaning of death—that death is not a fearsome ordeal for the Christian, but his release for union with Almighty God, his maker.

Colonel Igoe's life was indeed a worthy preparation for death and the life that follows. It was a long life of service to his country, his community and his church. He was active in the affairs of government. His political career included service in the United States House of Representatives; the Board of Police Commissioners, of which he was president for 4 years; the Democratic State committee and, in later years, adviser to Democratic leaders, notably John J. Cochran, and our present Congressman FRANK M. KARSTEN.

In Mr. Igoe's conception, the political servant must be many things—adamant in principle, flexible in discretionary negotiation, broad and deep in his knowledge and understanding, just in his conduct and charitable to all men. Mr. Igoe, in the execution of that concept, personified the Christian ideal. He was, in an intensely personal way, concerned with the poor and underprivileged. In St. Louis he participated until the end of his life on boards and committees of many civic and welfare organizations and contributed profoundly of himself to those in distress. Mr. Igoe's concern for his fellow man was not administratively limited; he knew the poor so well because he knew them from a personal love which sprang from intimate association. He was nationally known for his leadership as a member of the superior council of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, he was president of the National Conference of Catholic Charities for a year, and for 25 years he served on the board of directors of the Catholic Charities of St. Louis. He was also a member of the Holy Name Society, the Catholic Laymen's Retreat League, the Knights of Columbus, and the Society of St. Vincent de Paul of St. Gabriel's parish.

Colonel Igoe was a man of deep religious conviction. Throughout life he was close to his church, to his Catholic faith. His was the life of a true servant of God. He loved God with heart and mind, and effectively served Him as the servant of his fellow man. He learned well the injunction of our divine Lord—"He that will be first among you, shall be your servant. For I have given you an example, that as I have done to you so do you also."

We pray, therefore, with confidence for his advent into the glory of eternal light—and I am certain that the Lord will say to him, as He said to another servant, "Because you have been faithful over a few things, I will place you over many things. Enter into the joy of the Lord."

The Great Oil Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1953

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Youngstown Vindicator, of Thursday, May 7, 1953:

THE GREAT OIL GIVEAWAY

The tidelands oil deal, approved by the Senate 56 to 35, may not be the greatest giveaway in history, but certainly is one of the biggest and deserves the epithet of "the great oil robbery of 1953" applied by opponents.

The Senate bill, and one passed earlier by the House, hand over to 3 or 4 coastal States resources worth billions which actually belong to the people of all the States. The deal violates the principle stated by Senator LEHMAN, of New York: "Beyond the water's edge there is no Texas, no California, no Louisiana, no New York. There is only the United States of America."

Ohioans may well resent the surrender of their share of the oil assets by most of their Representatives in the House and by Senators TAFT and BRICKER.

No question of taking the Federal Government out of private enterprise is involved. Under Federal control the oil would still be developed by private companies. The difference is that the proceeds from leases would go to all the people, to whom the resources belong as decided by the Supreme Court, instead of going to a few States. As the cartoon on this page indicates, under Federal control the money was to be distributed among all the States for education.

The program is not only wrong in principle but dangerous in practice. It strengthens the selfish interests which are trying to get control of such other national resources as waterpower, minerals, forests, and grazing lands. A strong hint of this appeared in the amendment offered on the last day of Senate debate, to empower the public-land States to develop oil and other minerals in the Federal land within their borders, and pocket the proceeds.

More Court action is expected, particularly on the provision giving Texas and Florida the oil for 10½ miles out. Yet, as the Supreme Court conceded, no legal barrier prevents Congress from giving away the national treasure. It is unfortunate that President Eisenhower's ill-advised campaign promises will impel him to sign the giveaway.

surtax rates forbade the taking of profits and encouraged the taking of losses. Beginning in the year 1922 a large increase in reported profits is discernible, which amounts in both tables to a substantial excess over losses in 1924, the first year in which the present method of taxing capital gains and treating capital losses went into effect. While some allowance must be made for the great prosperity enjoyed in 1924 and 1925, the statistics support the conclusion that the capital-gains tax has removed the restraint exercised by the surtax rate on profit taking.

The same trend in the relation of gains to losses is indicated in the following table prepared for this committee covering the returns of all individual taxpayers. Statistics of losses are not available and the losses stated below are estimated from selected actual figures:

Actual profits and estimated losses on sale of assets regardless of time for which such assets were held

Year	Actual profits on sales of assets	Percent profit to total income	Estimated losses on sale of assets	Approximate percent loss to total deductions
1917	$318,170,617	2.63	$110,720,384	12.50
1918	291,185,704	1.64	571,468,120	31.38
1919	999,364,287	4.45	1,175,140,997	45.58
1920	1,020,542,719	3.82	1,680,304,149	56.87
1921	462,858,673	1.98	1,832,641,653	48.85
1922	991,351,580	3.99	1,251,989,891	35.41
1923	1,172,154,628	4.00	1,619,082,743	36.15
1924	1,513,714,092	5.12	896,906,462	22.45
1925	2,932,228,840	11.60	655,078,024	19.05
Total	9,701,571,140	--------	9,739,332,423	--------

It is pointed out that in all three tables set forth in the preceding pages the ratio of gains to total income shows a marked increase in each case beginning with the year 1922, coinciding with the introduction of the capital-gains rate of tax. Although the full effect of this rise may not be attributable entirely to the reduction of the rate, it is significant that the remarkable activity of the stock markets did not take place until some time later. A fair inference may be drawn that the lowering of the rate largely contributed to bring activity in the sale of property.

EXHIBIT 3. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1927, PAGES 10–11

Individual income tax: The Revenue Act of 1926 made sweeping changes affecting the taxation of individual incomes by increasing the personal credit exemption for single persons 50 percent and that for married persons and heads of families 40 percent, by increasing the earned-income credit and by decreasing the normal and surtax rates. More than 44 percent of the individual taxpayers were relieved from income-tax payments. In 1924, 4,489,698 individuals returned taxable net income, whereas in 1925 the number fell to 2,501,166, a decrease of almost 2 million. Under the new law the rates of normal tax were reduced from 2 percent, 4 percent, and 6 percent to 1½ percent, 3 percent, and 5 percent, respectively. Surtax rates were cut from a maximum of 40 percent to a maximum of 20 percent. The earned-income provision was so extended as to apply to a maximum of $20,000 of such incomes as compared with the limit in the former act of $10,000.

It was very naturally anticipated that these changes would result in considerable loss of revenue. In fact, the report of the Ways and Means Committee submitted to the House estimated a reduction of $46 million in normal tax paid and a reduction of $98,575,000 in returns from the surtax. As a matter of fact, however, the individual returns for the calendar year 1925 showed a larger tax than did those for 1924. The individual-income tax returned for 1924 was $704,265,390, and for 1925 $734,555,183, an increase of $30,289,793. As estimated, there was a very large falling off in the normal tax return. Before the deduction of earned income and capital loss credits, the normal tax returns decreased $41,434,565. On the other hand, surtax returns decreased only $4,687,627, while the capital gains tax increased $68,967,907. There was a net gain of $22,845,715, to which must be added $6,067,280, representing a decrease in the earned-income credit, and $1,376,798, representing a decrease in the capital loss credit.

The results are attributable to several causes: First and most important was the increased prosperity of the country as exemplified by the increased income from certain sources, despite the reduction in number of returns. The income from dividends returned, which were $3,250,913,954 in 1924 rose to $3,464,624,648 in 1925 despite fewer returns and the reduction in total income returned. More important than any other changes was the enormous increase in the income reported from the sale of property, both under the capital-gains section and under the general provisions. Income from the sale of property under the general provision reported for 1924 amounted to $1,124,565,568, while in 1925 this figure had jumped to $1,991,659,499, an increase of $867,093,841, or 77 percent. In addition, income under the capital net gains section increased from $389,148,434 to $940,569,341, an increase of $551,420,907, or 142 percent, and the tax from $48,603,064 in 1924 to $117,570,971 for 1925. In fact, the increased revenue from the capital-gains tax more than offset the loss of $46,122,192 in normal and surtax returns.

In the second place, the entire decrease in taxable incomes occurred in the classes not in excess of $5,000, while for those in excess of $5,000 it materially increased. The number of taxable returns with income of less than $5,000 decreased 55 percent, while the number in excess of $5,000 increased 18 percent; in excess of $25,000, 32 percent; in excess of $100,000, 67 percent; in excess of $300,000, 104 percent, and in excess of $1 million, 176 percent.

The Treasury Department has always contended that in the long run the taxation of income at moderate rates would be more productive than at very high rates. The soundness of this contention appears to have been amply borne out by the tax returns under the law of 1926, for both the calendar years 1925 and 1926.

The sources of the income returned for the calendar year 1925 as compared with 1924 clearly illustrate the effect of the new revenue act. The total national income undoubtedly greater in 1925 than in 1924, due to increased prosperity, but the income actually returned for individual income tax purposes was less, due to the entire exemption of over 40 percent of the 1924 income taxpayers. The income returned on account of wages and salaries was about $3,875,000,000 less; from individual businesses about $1,100 million less; from rents and royalties about $538 million less; and from interest and investments about $467 million less. On the other hand, increased income was returned from dividends and from sale of property. Dividends increased about $214 million, while the gains from the sale of property, including that returned as capital net gains, increased about $1,418,500,000. The largest reductions in net income reported for tax purposes, in the income from wages and salaries and in the income returned on account of individual business, were in the lower tax brackets. The reductions in returns from rents and royalties and interest and investment income were almost entirely in the lower brackets. The greatest beneficiaries of the 1926 act were, therefore, people of small incomes, wage earners, salaried men, and men operating small individual business enterprises.

Paid in Full—Tidelands Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1953

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the following very eloquent editorial from the Trenton (N. J.) Trentonian of May 6 expresses very effectively many of my own views on the so-called tidelands legislation. I believe Congress and President Eisenhower should work out a fairer and more morally tenable solution to this complex question. If this fails, I hope our Supreme Court will again decide this issue along the lines of its previous decision. The editorial follows:

PAID IN FULL

(By Edmund Goodrich, editor and publisher of the Trentonian)

Like the cat that ate the canary, the great sovereign States of Texas, California, and Louisiana can now sit back and lick their chops.

The tidelands bill cleared the Senate yesterday.

Thus the gift season has been moved ahead more than 6 months. But it was Uncle Sam, and not Santa Claus, who did the dishing out.

Morals in government being such as they are today, it is not too surprising that Congress decided to give away some of our priceless national assets. We are surprised, however, that men like President Eisenhower, Senator TAFT, Senators SMITH and HENDRICKSON of New Jersey, and others of their dependable caliber were such acquiescent parties to the highly dubious transaction.

We are also surprised, indeed, amazed, at the speed with which the coup was executed.

Why the hurry? What was the compelling factor behind the sudden decision to change the 180-year-old territorial status of our States?

Were the benefactors fearful that time might change the people's thinking and reverse the tide against the tidelanders?

Were they afraid the people might come to the conclusion that Texas, California, and Louisiana—Democratic States all—were being paid in full for helping the Republicans win the election last November?

Why should a discriminatory measure such as this have been speedballed through Congress at a time when so many matters of more vital interest to all States required our undivided time and consideration?

Why, all of a sudden, did the overgrasping desires of a few coastal States take precedence over the pressing needs of inland States which outnumber them nearly 10 to 1?

If this isn't a political payoff, then what is it, we'd like to know?

About three decades ago a Cabinet member was sent to Federal prison for conspiring with private interests to exploit mineral rights on public lands. We have reference, of course, to the infamous Teapot Dome scandal, just in case your memory doesn't go back to the early twenties.

Manipulations like that were contrary to law and public policy then.

They still are.

No public official today would dream of sacrificing any of our national assets for private gain.

Yet Congress is willing to pass a law giving these assets to certain States; allowing them, thereunder and thereby, to do the very things which Federal laws and sound public policy do not condone.

The matter of precedent also is pertinent. If, for example, we are justified in extending the offshore boundaries of coastal States by giving them submerged property belonging to our Central Government, what will it lead to? What will become of our national parks and forests under such a policy?

Will intrastate boundaries be extended into these valuable precincts if inland States decided to pull Uncle Sam's beard for a chunk of public land?

If not, why not? One premise sounds as logical as the other—at least where political considerations are involved.

What about the countless—and in some instances uncharted—Hawaiian Islands, which soon will be admitted to statehood? Where will their boundaries start and stop?

Under the silly tidelands bill they'll probably wind up with jurisdiction over the entire Pacific Ocean—provided, of course, California doesn't beat them to the punch.

And what about the Coast Guard? Will it remain under Federal jurisdiction or will the privileged coastal States take it over? (We suppose the latter question answers itself: Depends on who pays.)

One of a democracy's greatest virtues is the principle of majority rule. One of its greatest weaknesses is that the majority is not always right.

In this case the majority must be wrong. Otherwise it wouldn't be so easy for the cat to eat the canary.

Communism Will Not Be Destroyed by Bombs or Bullets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1953

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Charles A. Wells, editor and publisher of Between the Lines is an outstanding Christian journalist, who expresses his views candidly and vigorously. In his newsletter of May 1, he points out the truth that cannot be refuted. In his column entitled "X-Ray and Forecast," he points out in part that the free nations cannot destroy communism by invading Russia or its satellites for the purpose of overcoming the Communist terror which besets the world today. I do not always agree with the views expressed by Mr. Wells but I admire his courage and tenacity in asserting basic truths in our relationship with other nations.

Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a portion of Mr. Wells' column X-Ray and Forecast:

Voice of world opinion: The press, authoritative observers, business leaders, diplomats, and statesmen—in London, Tokyo, New Delhi, Paris, Stockholm, Amsterdam, Berlin, Rome—reveal a state approaching alarm over the failure of Americans to grasp the essential elements in the conflicts and tensions of our day.

World opinion regards Eisenhower as offering strong, hopeful leadership at times, but that his achievements are crippled through the undercutting by elements of his own political regime and by his sharing of Washington's continued overemphasis on militarism to meet problems that lie beyond the range of military power. Our military, industrial, and economic superiority will gain us nothing if this world view toward us continues, for contrary to the opinions of the hard-shell isolationists, America cannot live alone, world trade is vital to our prosperity and a high percentage of the raw materials we require now must come from abroad.

Many top world leaders fear that because of America's lack of understanding of the problems and sentiments of others, in Asia—Japan, India, Burma—will swing away from us, and that Europe will seek a strong, neutral, independent ground that will wreck our 5 years of costly NATO rearmament planning to build a free democratic world around us. While our European and Asian allies will resist communism they will deal with Russia as suits them, and their economic needs dictate, which will greatly strengthen the Soviet position and weaken our own. These processes are already under way. It is known in diplomatic circles that even Churchill in England is lending weight to this breakaway from America's leadership.

Such developments will affect the fortunes of all Americans, for Asia and Europe will resist commercial associations with us, establish stronger independent economic ties with their neighbors whether Communist or not. With this trend abroad and tariff barriers rising here, our prosperity will be considerably dampened. We will no longer be the center of worldwide trade which has been official Washington's quietly spoken apologia to American business for much of our admittedly expanding military domination. There are flashes of brilliant leadership on the part of Eisenhower and other peace-minded leaders in Washington which reveal an awareness of these issues and an apparent intention of dealing sincerely with them, but, as a noted British editor put it, "These brief moments are soon clouded over with the provincialism and blind political arrogance that now characterizes the American political arena."

The chief barrier to American understanding of today's events is our continued obsession with military might, our entrapment in a war-bred economy with its treacherous prosperity, and our intoxication from absorbing vast quantities of our own distorted propaganda. While we have built a great wall of military defense around us, it has been on such a costly scale and involving such profligate waste that no nation can afford to walk with us—a condition that easily creates fears and resentment.

Our failure to utilize properly our great material, political, and spiritual resources, and to understand the rest of the world, arises out of the following false assumptions:

1. That the Communists are planning to conquer the world through the use of the Russian Army or Navy or airpower.

2. That all political and economic unrest and disintegration today is a result of Communist plotting.

3. That we can therefore stop communism only by armed might and by supporting any regime, no matter how rotten and oppressive, as long as it opposes the Communists.

In these three fallacies, you find the roots of the military extremism that, under both the Democrats and the present administration, brings us nearer to economic disaster through high taxes and inflation, and also the source of the reactionary fanaticism which now dominates the Republican Party and well may destroy the GOP itself and do irreparable harm to America's future.

Here are the truths that must be recognized, that stand in opposition to these great fallacies:

1. The Communist plot for world conquest centers in the Marx and Lenin doctrine of infiltration, education (Marxist), agitation, and revolution, with civil revolts by the oppressed masses promoted from within and with the seizure of power by native Communists from within—rather than by the invasion of Russian armed power from without. The Communists have followed this plan without exception in the Red expansionist drive. The Russian armed power is to be used only as a background, to maintain the defensive might of the great mother of all the Soviets—Russia—and as a source of military supplies for the native-led Red forces in non-Communist areas. For it is true that violence is urged as the only means of destroying capitalism and the capitalistic states. Even civil war is urged as the best means "to utterly destroy the last remaining vestiges of the capitalists' political power." (See The Thesis and Statutes of the Communist International, or The Russian Revolution, by Lenin, or The Foundation of Leninism, by Stalin.)

But violence in civil revolt and civil war is not the same thing by any means as an invasion of the Russian Army. And no nation, the United States or anyone else, can hurl armies into a neighboring state to prevent these people from going Communist of their own accord, by whatever means employed, without starting incalculable difficulties. This was the trap which snared us in Korea. How many Koreas could we attempt?

2. Most of the political upheavals and disintegrations of our day, such as the collapse of China, revolts in Indochina, Iran, Egypt, Africa, etc., would have occurred under other symbols, other banners and slogans—even if the Communists had never existed? In some places the Communists have been able to hasten and direct these historic revolutionary changes, as they unquestionably did in China. But they have not created these trends—they have utilized and exploited them for their own evil ends. The facts of India's great emergency and Africa's awakening, both with little or no Communist influence, provide ample proof of this historic direction.

American influence and strategy is thus being terribly handicapped by the narrow partisan fanaticism that attempts to label as Communistic all world changes that threaten the privileged position of wealth, that attributes unrest in Europe, the fall of China and the general chaos of Asia, to the machinations of the reds and pinks in our State Department. There were reds in the State Department and Moscow has done a lot of plotting, but to focus all energy and resources on this small portion of the picture is like the hunter who beats his dog for its failure to corner the game—while the bear charges. Whether they are in Congress or right next door, those who foster this juvenile, totally inadequate concept of today's need are doing more harm to American influence, strength, and leadership than several shiploads of rag-tailed Reds. The FBI could take care of the Reds but the hotheads and fanatics in Congress can thwart, domineer, and pervert the FBI as well as hamstring American leadership.

3. We can't stop communism by supporting corrupt, oppressive regimes—Franco of Spain, French colonialism in Indochina, etc.—as we pointed out in our last issue. On the basis of shortsighted military expediency, to back Franco and the French colonialism can appear reasonable. But we cannot protect the principles of capitalistic wealth from communism by bolstering rotten selfish wealth on an equal footing with our support of honest Christian wealth that justifies its existence by promoting the good of all men. One of the great facts of this century is that we can only protect wealth in this day by transforming it into wealth that shares—a principle that some in our churches and pulpits have not even yet come to see.

As an emphatic illustration of this situation, it is interesting to note that the King of Cambodia (a state in Indochina) is now in America and in an interview in the New

veteran patients because of the shortage of necessary Veterans' Administration facilities.

In a recent report to Gov. Earl Warren, the department commanders of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the AMVETS, estimated that in 1948 there were approximately 1,750,000 veterans in the State. On December 31, 1952, the Veterans' Administration estimated that there were 1,539,000 veterans in the State. The California department of veterans' affairs believes that, as of January 1953, the correct figure was very close to 2,000,000. In view of the disparity between these estimates, it is essential that there be a prompt resurvey of the veteran population of the State. Veterans are still migrating to California in such numbers that previous estimates become obsolete almost overnight.

As a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have today sent to the Veterans' Administrator a letter urging immediate steps to provide an accurate and up-to-date census of California's veteran population. At the same time, I am requesting the Governor of California to lend full assistance to this urgent task. I am confident that when the full facts are known to the Congress, there will not be a single Member of the House who will oppose prompt corrective action as a matter of simple justice to the veterans of California, some of whom are former constituents of each of you.

However, action in one respect cannot wait for this information to be made available. In the case of veterans needing neuropsychiatric care, immediate relief is vital. The California Department of Mental Hygiene reports that there are over 4,600 veterans hospitalized in State mental institutions. For the most part, California taxpayers are paying for their care, although approximately 40 percent of them came to California from other States. The Veterans' Administration has only two hospitals in California, plus one under construction, to take care of neuropsychiatric patients from Arizona, Nevada, and other Western States, as well as those from California. There are long waiting lists of eligible veterans. This situation is intolerable, both from the standpoint of the veteran who needs and is entitled to hospitalization, and also from that of society, to whom many of these veterans may at any time become dangerous.

On October 19, 1946, a new 1,000-bed neuropsychiatic hospital was approved for construction in the San Francisco area. Since that time some $400,000 has been spent preparing the site and providing a fence for the area; however, construction funds have not yet been made available. Meanwhile, veterans have continued to migrate into the State and the impact of the Korean war on this principal port of debarkation is making the situation more acute from month to month.

May I urge the Appropriations Committee and my colleagues of the House to recognize the urgency of our need and to assign to this project the number one priority position for hospital construction which the facts of the case so amply justify.

Submerged Lands Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. (BOB) WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1953

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, last week this body passed H. R. 4198 with the Senate amendments, concerning title to certain submerged lands. Among my reasons for voting for this bill is my understanding that the bill will not necessitate any change in the traditional United States policy with respect to the breadth of the territorial sea.

Mr. Speaker, the tuna industry of southern California is the largest and most valuable fishing industry of the United States. The great bulk of tuna used by this industry is caught by vessels operating out of the port of San Diego in my district. These vessels operate off the coast of the United States and of nine countries of Latin America facing on the eastern tropical Pacific. They customarily fish in the waters from California south to and including the high seas off Peru. Many of these countries in the past several years have made claims to extended jurisdiction over the high seas adjacent to their coasts. These claims have, for the most part, not been applied against our vessels and none of them have been accepted in the international field as being valid. The reason for this has been that the United States in each instance has protested to the claiming government that it reserved all rights of its vessels to operate on the high seas without molestation from a foreign country and that it considered the high seas to commence 3 miles from the low-water mark of any coast.

If the United States should modify in any respect its policy with respect to the breadth of territorial waters, that is that the proper breadth of the territorial sea is 3 miles measured from the low-water mark, then these claims would once more burst forth upon us and severely cripple, if not entirely incapacitate, the fisheries of this country—and also adversely affect our merchant marine, airlines, and Navy.

My grounds for supporting H. R. 4198 are as follows:

First. Section 6 of the bill specifically reserves to the United States Government, as does the Constitution, all powers of regulation and control over said lands and waters needed for the conduct of international affairs.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs left no doubt as to what it meant by this section. Senator CORDON, the acting chairman, in reporting the bill to the Senate for the committee said—in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1, page 2617—that the purpose clearly was to enunciate as emphatically as possible that the rights of the Federal Government in international affairs cannot be interfered with by any situation created under the resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 13. The resolution, he said, sought to transfer, establish, and vest in the States proprietary interests which in themselves are proprietary in character, but in no sense governmental. This makes it quite plain that the committee sought in this bill to transfer to the coastal States dominium over the contiguous territorial sea and seabed but to retain imperium to the United States. This is, in fact, all it could do under the Constitution. Accordingly, this bill will not necessitate a change in the policy of the United States with respect to the other members of the international community.

Second. This bill does not seek to establish where the Gulf of Mexico boundaries of the State of Florida and the State of Texas are. It deliberately and intentionally leaves those issues moot. The pertinent section is the last sentence of section 4. The acting chairman of the Senate committee reporting the bill to the Senate states plainly on page 2618 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 1 that the purpose of the joint resolution was to create by law a status and condition which existed in fact up to the time of the California decision. He stated further, on page 2620, that it was not a part of the power or duty of the Congress to make determinations with reference to these boundaries or where these boundaries should lie. He said quite properly that this is a matter for the courts to determine, or for the United States through Congress and the legislative organizations of the several States to reach an agreement upon. He further said that this bill did not seek to invade either of these provinces but left both exactly where the Congress found them. He said quite flatly that the pending bill did not seek to prejudge these issues or to determine them. On page 2634 he mentioned further that the boundaries of the States cannot be changed by Congress without the consent of the States. He stated quite properly that the Congress cannot do anything legislatively in that field and did not attempt to do so in this bill. Accordingly, it seems plain to me that this bill does not affect, either one way or another, the extended claims of Texas and Florida in the Gulf of Mexico. Therefore, there is no reason for the United States to change its traditional policy on the extent of the territorial sea until such a time in the future as the courts or the Congress in conjunction with the legislatures of the States properly effect such a change in the presently understood boundaries of Texas and Florida.

Third. The United States has long held and holds up to the present moment, so far as I know, that a nation cannot unilaterally change its boundaries with respect to the other members of the international community. In the final act of the Conference on United States-Ecuadoran Fishery Relations concluded April 14, 1953, in Quito, Ecuador, occurs the following agreement between the two official delegations of the two nations:

The conference agrees that it is not within its competence to resolve differences in

legal dispositions and juridical concepts of the United States and Ecuador regarding territorial waters and innocent passage the principles of which in any event are not susceptible of bilateral determination since these principles are matters for determination only by the general agreement of maritime states.

The gist of this same statement has been included in numerous protests and reservations which the United States has made to nations which sought to extend their coastal boundaries into the high seas through unilateral action over the course of the past several years.

I assume that the United States will apply at home those same precepts which for many years it has attempted to have applied abroad.

Fourth. Under our Constitution, treaty law supersedes congressional law. The United States is bound by treaty with Great Britain, Panama, Cuba, and other countries to uphold the principle of a breadth of territorial sea of 3 geographic miles in width, measured from the low-water mark.

The language in the pertinent convention of 1924 with Panama—Treaty Series No. 707—is:

ARTICLE 1. The high contracting parties declare that it is their firm intention to uphold the principle that 3 marine-miles extending from the coastline outwards, and measured from low-water mark, constitute the proper limit of territorial waters.

I assume that the United States cannot change this policy without first abrogating these several treaties. Any one of these four reasons which I cite appear strong enough to me to support the view that the pending legislation does not necessitate any change in the traditional policy of the United States with respect to the breadth of the territrial sea. All four of these reasons, when taken together, seem to make that case incontrovertible. Accordingly, I assume that this measure will do no harm to the great tuna fishing industry of my State and district.

I might say that the remarks I have made with respect to the tuna industry of my State and district apply equally to the shrimp industry of the States facing on the Gulf of Mexico, the great bottom fisheries of New England which fish off the shores of Canada near Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, and the fisheries of the State of Washington for halibut, for troll salmon and for bottom fish caught by means of trawls off the west coast of British Columbia, and particularly in Hecate Straits.

The general interest of the United States fishing industry in this subject was aptly stated by Dr. W. M. Chapman, then Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State, on May 25, 1950, to the Subcommittee on Fisheries of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in connection with an investigation of a seizure by Mexico of several United States shrimp vessels. This appears on pages 11 and 12 of that statement. He says:

The fish populations which provide the raw material for four-fifths or more of the fishing industry now active in the United States either inhabit the high seas of the world or move back and forth between the high seas and the marginal seas of the contiguous countries.

The tuna fishery has become the most valuable marine fishery of the United States. Nine-tenths of its yield comes from areas of the high seas which are contiguous to the 10 American Republics south of San Diego on the Pacific coast. The fishery is still in a rapid state of expansion both volumewise and geographically. Nearly all sources of further expansion lie in the high seas off the coasts of other countries both in the Pacific and the Atlantic.

The great fisheries that have been prosecuted by New Englanders for 300 years lie for the most part in the high seas contiguous to the coast of Canada. All expansion that is anticipated lies in the direction of being farther and farther from our coasts, northward and eastward around the corner of Newfoundland and up Davis Strait past Greenland and Labrador.

In the Pacific Northwest we have valuable fisheries for salmon, halibut, various ground fish, albacore, and other fishes in the high seas contiguous to British Columbia. Our Pacific fisheries are expanding outward into the multitudinous islands of Oceania, which are under the jurisdiction of many nations.

The fishery for shrimp in the Gulf of Mexico has become one of our most rapidly growing and valuable fisheries. New banks are being discovered one after the other. The rapidly expanding fishery is moving south into the high seas contiguous to our neighbors to the south. It is known that large unused resources of shrimp lie farther south waiting the harvest and going to waste each year for want of it.

Thus if we permit the loss of our fisheries that now exist in the high seas contiguous to the coasts of foreign countries we lose the biggest half of our fishing industry at one stroke.

Even this, however, is not so serious as the fact that we would at the same time lose the right to expand these fisheries as this Nation's need for protein food and animal oils expands with our growing population.

The food resources of our land area are strictly limited. The vast food resources available in the sea are only now being realized as the result of ocean-research programs which have been going on during and since the war. Undreamed-of new technical means are being designed and put into use to harvest food resources not known to mankind before. The picture of harvesting food from the sea is changing with such rapidity that no man can tell today what shape or volume it will take next year or the years thereafter.

We cannot afford to allow ourselves to be exluded from access to these raw materials of the sea.

If one nation can unilaterally extend its sovereign territory out to sea by as much as a quarter of a mile, then there is no reason why it or any other nation cannot extend its boundaries seaward by 200 miles, by 400 miles, or by such distance it may desire. In the chaotic situation that such claims and counterclaims would bring about, the United States would not stand to be the gainer, nor, I believe, would mankind generally.

Whether the band of marginal sea is 2 miles, 3 miles, or 6 miles is not a matter of the greatest practical importance. The important practical point is that it must be narrow in order to prevent those nations who are able to harvest the resources of the sea from being excluded from access to these resources. (Quotation from pp. 298 and 299 of the hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U. S. Senate, Submerged Lands.)

Our Defense Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 18, 1953

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent address entitled "Our Defense Policy." The address has attracted considerable attention throughout the country and was delivered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] as an Armed Forces Day speech at Enid, Okla.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR DEFENSE POLICY

(Address by Hon. STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri)

It is an honor to be with you here on Armed Forces Day at Vance Air Force Base. It is always a privilege and a pleasure to be in Oklahoma, the great neighbor of my own Missouri.

I wish to pay tribute to Oklahoma's two outstanding Senators, BOB KERR and MIKE MONRONEY. I know them both well, and work with them day after day in the United States Senate. They stand for the best that there is in Government, and you can well be proud of the accomplishments of these men. They work not only for the good of Oklahoma, but for the good of the whole country.

It so happens that as Secretary of the Air Force it was my privilege to issue the order that reactivated this airbase. I recall the occasion when BOB KERR came to consult with me about it. I had long known of his great interest in national defense and I had warmly applauded his efforts in helping to establish the Air Force as a separate arm of the military. I am proud that BOB KERR is not only a great friend of aviation but also a friend of mine.

Senators KERR and MONRONEY made a most persuasive case for the reactivation of this base. Their arguments were sound and patriotic.

It was particularly fitting that the Enid, Okla., base should be reactivated, not only because of the intrinsic merit of the base, but also as a recognition of BOB KERR's outstanding contribution to the cause of national defense and to the peace of the world.

In connection with the peace of the world, I want to talk a few minutes today about our defense policy.

The success or failure of any business depends primarily upon the planning and programing ability of its leaders.

The security of any country also depends primarily upon such planning, along with its spiritual, economic, and military strength of the nation.

One sure way to obtain minimum military return from maximum economic effort is to constantly raise and lower the planning of military programs.

Today, as was recently pointed out in a fine editorial, the free world lives by the grace of a thin line of defense; a line so thin that we have had but 12 Sabre jets—our only plane capable of beating the MIG—patrolling the entire European and middle eastern border of that free world.

Only a dozen planes, and yet military leaders such as President Eisenhower and Field Marshal Montgomery have declared that airpower is the dominant factor in war today.

it. And it may turn out that his idea of what is merely greedy, but not too greedy, is not different from that of anybody else who has something to sell. Just the same, I imagine Secretary Weeks won't take Secretary McKay into his club until he is sure he isn't inclined to be objective in matters of this kind."

"Do you have to be a member of the Cabinet to join?"

"For the alpha chapter, maybe you do, but there's the making of a good chapter in Congress: All the Senators and Representatives who are standing firmly against price, wage, and rent controls; even against standby legislation to be used in case of a national emergency. And all the Members who oppose low-rent housing. And the Members now proposing to allow the railroads to raise rates without waiting for the Interstate Commerce Commission to pass on them. And those opposing the reciprocal trade agreements. You can think of others."

"Tell me, Old Timer, did they ever really make wooden nutmegs in Connecticut?"

"I doubt it, but if they did, people probably just thought it was cute. Those were the good old days."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1953

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, we have before us many problems which should have the consideration of all of us. One of them is the building of the St. Lawrence seaway. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Building Seaway Piecemeal Still Doesn't Justify It," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING SEAWAY PIECEMEAL STILL DOESN'T JUSTIFY IT

Support of the St. Lawrence seaway by the Eisenhower Cabinet in no way changes the fundamental objections to that project.

The plan proposed by the administration represents a tactical retreat by the seaway proponents. We are told, for example, that instead of building it all the way to Duluth, it is to be built only as far as Toledo. We are told, also, that instead of costing over a billion dollars the curtailed plan will cost only $100 million and be self-liquidating.

Anyone who has watched the spending of Government money will find difficulty in assuming that so much of a billion-dollar seaway can be built for a mere "$100 million."

What we are not told is that once the seaway interests win this battle, they will have rammed a big boot in the doorway.

Even before it is finished we may expect to hear that doing this job half will not be enough. We also may expect to be told that our investment in the piecemeal plan may be largely wasted unless we spend the rest of the money to finish the seaway.

None of the compromise arguments in any way answer the primary objections to the seaway project. Those are:

First, that it would tax all the American people for the commercial benefit of a very few; second, that it would subsidize, with Government money, development of inland ports at the expense of the existing ports along the Atlantic, including Philadelphia; third, that it would subsidize interests, many of them Canadian, at the expense of Atlantic coast shippers and eastern railroads and all whose livelihoods depend on them.

Seaway supporters like to cry that it is selfish for eastern cities to oppose their project. We find it difficult to understand why it is selfish for Philadelphia, for example, to defend its commerce while it is somehow unselfish for Great Lakes interests to demand use of Federal funds to artifically divert our commerce to their ports.

This newspaper remarked recently that if ever there was a time not to build the seaway, that time is now. The Eisenhower administration is trying to cut expenses everywhere, even including the costs of national defense. Just why millions should be spent for the seaway at a time when we are reducing expenditures for the Nation's security is mighty hard to understand.

Louisiana Boundary 3 Leagues From Shore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1953

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the following editorial from the New Orleans Item, issue of May 7, 1953:

TIDELANDS FIGHT GOES ON

With passage of the Holland bill by the Senate, the States have won an important phase of their battle for control of the marginal offshore oil.

It appears that the House will abandon its own already passed version of the tidelands bill and accept the Senate measure. If so, this will save time-wasting conferences and get the bill to President Eisenhower for his signature that much sooner.

The Senate measure confirms outright State ownership of coastal lands within the States' "historic boundaries."

It also provides that, even if the courts dispute Congress' right to quitclaim title to the States, the States will have authority to develop the natural resources of the marginal area.

Thus, whether or not court scraps develop over State ownership, State control will remain.

But the main battle over tidelands oil is by no means over.

Other questions—of equal significance—still must be fought out in Congress—and probably in the Supreme Court. These include—

A firm definition of exactly where State boundaries lie.

A determination of what role the States are to play in development of offshore lands beyond the historic boundaries.

These are issues of fundamental importance. For they will determine what interest, if any, Louisiana is to have in the oil development beyond the 3-mile limit.

Under the Holland bill, our rights are clear only out to the 3-mile point.

And Louisiana, in particular, is one of those States which has a tremendous stake in the area beyond the 3-mile line.

The underwater bottoms off Louisiana gently away from shore for scores of miles.

With present techniques it is believed possible to drill some 40 or 50 miles out. Future developments might extend that range.

And the fact is, of the 240 wells already completed off the Louisiana coast, more than half are located beyond the 3-mile limit.

Thus, the possible revenue to be obtained from this far-flung outer area is far greater than that which is involved in the 3-mile coastal belt.

And, to protect our interests, Louisiana Senators, Congressmen, and other officials must follow two broad courses:

Prepare the soundest possible legal case to back up our claims to a boundary beyond the 3-mile limit.

Work to include in subsequent legislation clauses giving the coastal States a share of income from the area beyond their historic boundaries.

Texas and Florida have obtained some recognition for their claims of boundaries extending 10.5 miles offshore.

Governor Kennon argued in Washington recently that the law admitting Louisiana to the Union gave us the same limit—3 leagues, or 10.5 miles, beyond certain islands. Louisiana's case in this respect should be pressed with all possible vigor.

Congress now faces the problem of passing a second offshore oil bill dealing with the submerged lands beyond State boundaries.

It may decide to define the State limits in this bill, giving due recognition to the claims of Texas, Florida, and Louisiana. If not, the matter of boundaries is sure to end up in the courts.

As for a State voice in oil operations beyond State boundaries, the Government may give coastal States power to regulate and tax this development.

Or it may allocate to the States 37.5 percent of the revenue from these lands, as is done in the case of public lands in the interior.

But, however it is accomplished, it is vital to Louisiana that a fair division of the proceeds from the outer lands be worked out.

Billions of dollars are involved.

And this source of potential revenue is of inestimable importance to this State. It is needed to supply Louisiana with vital educational facilities and to support basic governmental services in the decades to come.

Hon. Thomas C. Buchanan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1953

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
May 12, 1953.

THOMAS C. BUCHANAN, Esq.,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUCHANAN: It is with great regret that I have to forego the privilege and pleasure of being with you today to join with your associates and friends in paying tribute to you for the outstanding service you have rendered as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

I do not want to let this opportunity pass, however, without expressing the strong feeling I have that you have acted as the people's advocate on a commission where it is essential to have men who cannot be swerved from duty by emoluments, threats, or cajoleries.

race doctrine. Our 18- and 19-year-old men are dying in this foreign land to eliminate prejudice because of race, creed, political beliefs, and color. We have contributed $87 billion in direct relief and loans to help more unfortunate people. It is for the same people throughout the same free world that we must keep the Walter-McCarran Naturalization and Immigration Act.

My friends, read this law; explain its provisions to your fellow citizens. We must fight ignorance, selfishness, complacency, and indifference in America. Ask the opponents of this measure about the provisions of this great law; ask them to offer a fair and equitable substitute. You will find they cannot do it. This law is the will of the American people. Let us give it a chance.

I was saddened to hear our new President comment unfavorably on this law before it has had a chance to prove its worth to the free world. My plea to you is to stand up and be counted. Let us not destroy this law before it has had time to cope with this problem. An informed citizenship can go a long way toward preserving the United States of America. This law will do as much to save America and the free world as our guns, tanks, ships, planes, and atomic science. Let us be found along with the FBI, the Central Intelligency Agency, the American Legion, and countless patriotic organizations who are gallantly fighting to preserve the free world against the forces of Communist despotism.

On the monument to the late Senator Ben Hill, in Atlanta, we find these words: "He who saves his country saves all things, and all things saved will bless him. He who lets his country die, lets all things die, and all things dying will curse him."

MEETING SPONSONED BY THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE WALTER-MCCARRAN ACT, HELD IN PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY 7, 1953

The reception committee: Rear Adm. John V. McElduff, chairman; director civilian defense of Delaware County, Pa.; Harry C. Murray, secretary, past department of Pennsylvania aide-de-camp, 1946–47, VFW; James Gallagher, former Member of Congress, First District of Pennsylvania; Joseph Allen Reilly, Esq., past department of Pennsylvania, judge advocate, AMVETS; Arthur K. Barlow, director, civilian defense, Cheltenham Township, Montgomery County; W. Henry MacFarland, executive chairman, American flag committee; James Herbert Egen, Esq., Montgomery County attorney; Andrew W. Green, Esq., Harrisburg attorney; John Turner, M. D.; Edwin S. Rowland, Jr., abrasive engineer.

Who Receives Treatment in Veterans' Administration Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1953

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, to understand more clearly the composition of the patient load in Veterans' Administration hospitals, it is necessary to study the legal status for admission and the types of medical cases receiving treatment in Veterans' Administration hospitals. On January 31, 1952, the Veterans' Administration had 108,000 patients in hospitals.

Thirty-five and six-tenths percent were veterans receiving care for service-connected disabilities; 11.4 percent were veterans discharged from a military service for disabilities incurred in line of duty or veterans in receipt of compensation for service-connected disabilities but receiving treatment for disabilities other than their service-connected disability; six-tenths of 1 percent were nonveterans—United States Armed Forces personnel, humanitarian, and emergency cases; 31.8 percent were patients with non-service-connected conditions known to be chronic in nature, such as cancer, arthritis, or tuberculosis; 20.6 percent were patients with nonchronic, non-service-connected disabilities.

The last group of 20.6 percent, who are patients with non-service-connected, nonchronic conditions, are made up of veterans who are receiving a pension for a permanent and totally disabling nonservice connection and other veterans who have signed a statement that they are unable to pay for their treatment.

The problem facing the Veterans' Administration in hospitalizing war veterans is entirely different from the problem facing other hospitals. The average World War I veteran is 61 years old and the average World War II veteran is 35 years old. The chronic nature of the Veterans' Administration patient load is indicated by the fact that over 50 percent of Veterans' Administration patients in hospitals on January 31, 1952, had already spent more than a year on hospital rolls as Veterans' Administration patients. Of the 103,774 patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals, 13.9 percent were tubercular, 47 percent were psychotic, 2.7 percent had other psychiatric disorders, and 5.1 percent had neurological disabilities.

Over a third of the tubercular patients had been on the hospital rolls for more than 1 year and well over a third of the psychotic patients had been in Veterans' Administration hospitals for more than 10 years.

In addition to those veterans receiving treatment in Veterans' Administration hospitals, the Veterans' Administration contantly has a waiting list of 20,000 to 30,000 veterans who are seeking admission to a Veterans' Administration hospital. Practically all service-connected cases are taken care of immediately; therefore, practically all of the waiting list consists of non-service-connected cases which are seeking admission on the basis of their inability to pay for treatment last year. On April 30, 1953, the waiting list of applicants eligible for hospital admission but not yet scheduled because a bed was not available was composed as follows:

Combination NP–TB	97
TB	2,378
Psychotic	11,779
Other psychiatric	2,590
Neurological	710
Medical	2,952
Surgical	4,303
Paraplegics	25
Total	24,834

A summary of these figures reveals several facts. A vast majority of patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals either have service-connected disabilities or have a long-term chronic condition which renders them unable to make a living and pay for their medical treatment. A very large percentage of Veterans' Administration hospital patients and those on the waiting list seeking admission are psychotic or tubercular patients who, if not treated in Veterans' Administration hospitals, in most instances would become a burden on the State. With a veteran population of more than 20,000,000, it is apparent that less than 1 percent of the veteran population is hospitalized in Veterans' Administration hospitals. The vast majority of veterans do not have service-connected disabilities, do not desire treatment in a Veterans' Administration hospital, or they are unable to sign the oath as to their inability to pay.

The Continental Shelf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY A. FINE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1953

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith editorial of the New York Times of May 15, 1953, in regard to the offshore oil bill legislation recently enacted. The editorial discusses the problem adequately, and I recommend it to my colleagues:

THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

Now that the bill giving to the States all the offshore oil out to their so-called historic boundaries has passed Congress and is awaiting the President's signature, it is more necessary than ever that the Federal Government be granted specific power to develop the vast undersea mineral resources still left in its control. The House has already approved legislation doing just that; and the Senate leadership has committed itself to bringing the matter up for consideration without delay.

The importance of this question is evident when we reflect that an estimated five-sixths of the huge oil reserves off this Nation's coasts lies beyond the boundaries of the Gulf States in relatively shallow waters extending as far as 200 miles out to sea. This is the area known as the Continental Shelf. The offshore oil bill which has just passed both Houses of Congress goes no further in respect to this area than to reaffirm a Presidential proclamation of 1945 declaring that the natural resources of the "subsoil and seabed" of the shelf "appertain to the United States" and are subject to its jurisdiction and control.

The Senate struck out an entire section of the bill providing for Federal development of the shelf. Now the House, by overwhelming vote, has in effect repassed this provision as a separate measure and thus forced it again upon the attention of the Senate. Unless the Senate also takes affirmative action, the Federal Government will technically have "control" of the area but will be unable to develop it by providing for leases of the oil-rich lands. Nor will it be able to arrange exchanges of already existing State leases for Federal leases.

What the Senate does about this bill will be the real test of the sincerity of those who argued that all the coastal States wanted was development rights for oil found close to their shorelines, not for oil discovered 50 or 100 miles out to sea. The very fact that Texas, Louisiana and the others now have

won their point that the undersea oil within certain claimed boundaries belongs to them makes it of particular interest to see whether or not they will support the counterbalancing measure giving development rights to the rest of the offshore oil—and by far the greater part of the total—to the United States.

We still think that all resources beyond low-water mark ought to belong to the people as a whole, but that issue has been settled at least temporarily. It is now up to the Senate to see that the Federal Government is permitted to go ahead with the development by private companies of the remaining part of the Continental Shelf contiguous to the coasts of the United States, and to be sole recipient of royalties from the fruits of that development.

The Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1953

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks a splendid editorial, The Press, appearing in the May 16, 1953, issue of the Pilot, the official newspaper of the archdiocese of Boston:

THE PRESS

In an unprecedented address to newsmen in Rome, the Holy Father this week recalled to them the dedication of their profession to the pursuit of truth in the service of lasting peace. Pointing out the easy temptation to distort the news picture in the interests of more dramatic publicity, he urged them to "obtain for truth, simply presented, a part of that considerate interest" which is so readily given to the sensational and the misleading lie. This is advice which it is well for us to ponder with recurring regularity.

Those of us who are working in the press field are always cautious to guard every gate against persons who for any reason threaten or seek to compromise the cherished freedom of the press. In our preoccupation with the defense of our own freedom, however, we sometimes run the risk of infringing on the legitimate freedoms of others. We must be ready, of course, to protect the legitimate and invaluable freedom of the press as a necessary part of that larger civil liberty without which the good society is unthinkable. At the same time we are forced to admit that something is wrong when good men trying to do an honest and forthright job find themselves in terrifying fear of the press.

All about us, if we pause long enough to notice, there are men in public life, and especially those in Government, who live in mortal terror of tomorrow's headline, not because they have done anything wrong, but because something they may have said contains the germ of a sensational story. It is easy for us to underestimate this terror, as it is always easy to be brave when the fright is not our own; it is easy also to say that it is unreasonable, but when a man's future and family are bound up in it, there is legitimate room for emotion. It would be good to be able to say that it is a chimera, a will-o'-the-wisp, with no basis in reality but if we are honest with ourselves we know that this is not so.

This is not to say that newsmen and editors are ogrelike watchdogs waiting to pounce upon the unsuspecting and exploit the casual remark at the expense of the speaker. What it more nearly means is that someone finds himself in need of a headline as the presses are waiting or sometimes in need of sales as the finances show signs of declining. There are few things more calculated to catch readers (and consequently advertisers) than the melodramatic story, even when built upon the flimsiest of evidence. For all that, we must admit that such actions are woeful distortions of the truth, in whose service we work.

The point is simply that there is a line beyond which we must not go, an area in which we are not really free at all—we are bound in by truth itself and straitened by the facts as they are. This does not merely mean, as the Pontiff mentioned, that all we say be true, but that no significant omissions mar the integrity of the story or no improper emphases be supplied which do violence to the context. It may be truly called an unreasonable fear if men worry about their press notices within these rules, but they have reason to worry when this devotion to truth is ignored.

By and large the press knows its obligations and stands up to them, but an examination of conscience on our fidelity to the whole truth does no harm to the best of us and can do much good for those who are faltering.

Usher L. Burdick, of North Dakota, a Distinguished Member of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS.
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1953

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress, it was my good fortune in the early days of this session to become acquainted with a very distinguished Member of this body, the Honorable USHER L. BURDICK. Since that time, and over almost daily early breakfasts in the House restaurant, my admiration and respect for this unique man have grown. His great ability, sharpness of mind, clarity of judgment, his warm friendliness, goodness of heart, and massive honesty—all of these wonderful attributes are well known to the membership of the House. So, too, Mr. Speaker, are his profound knowledge and his marvelous wit. An independent in every sense of the word; a disciple, I may say, of the elder La Follette—he speaks out without fear or favor whenever the occasion demands. Those of us who have come to know him well recognize him as a truly distinguished American. From humble beginnings and by dint of hard personal labor and a burning desire for education and success, he has hoisted himself to the enviable position of one of North Dakota's most distinguished sons. This great Midwestern State can well be proud of him.

Mr. Speaker, one can learn much from watching and listening to those who have come a long way on the highway of life. USHER L. BURDICK'S friendship has given me a greater sense of the value of man's goodness to man, a deeper appreciation of the struggle and history of the United States. I seize the opportunity to insert in the RECORD a highly interesting character study of a truly good American which appeared in last Sunday's Washington Star by Mary McGrory:

NO DOUBT ABOUT IT, MR. BURDICK IS A CHARACTER WITH CHARACTER

(By Mary McGrory)

Amid a discreet murmer of congressional approval for proposed congressional pay raises, there arose last week one loud roar of dissent. It came from USHER L. BURDICK, 74-year-old Republican Representative at Large from North Dakota, a crusty oldtimer who frankly told his colleagues they were jumping in the public trough with both feet.

From anybody else, such blunt talk would be resented as the mouthings of a publicity seeker or a curmudgeonly millionaire. But from Mr. BURDICK it was not only predictable, it was acceptable. In 16 years on the Hill, the North Dakotan has established himself as an authentic rugged individualist who proceeds from principle rather than perversity.

Go anywhere on Capitol Hill and ask about USHER BURDICK. "He's a character," you will be told. But your informant will hasten to explain that Mr. BURDICK is a character with character, neither a headache nor a bore, and assuredly not to be classed with the obstructionists and simple eccentrics who find their way to Congress.

NO PICKLEPUSS, HE

Nor is Mr. BURDICK, for all his dissenting and wrong thinking about such constructive projects as congressional pay hikes, a picklepuss. He is as friendly as a pup, as popular as a football star (which indeed he was in college) and possessed of a completely unwarped outlook on life.

But he is a reluctant Republican. Not so reluctant as Senator MORSE, of Oregon, who quit the party; he would never do a thing like that. Still, his reluctance to go along with the GOP can be gaged from what he did last year, when he went to the hospital. He left his proxy for pairs on domestic issues with Representative MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, majority leader in the then Democratic-controlled House.

USHER BURDICK would never leave his proxy with the Democrats to be cast on foreign issues. His opinion of the United Nations and such-like foreign entanglements is uncomplicated: He's agin' them. He is a rock-ribbed isolationist, even in his own introverted part of the country. Still, he is for reciprocal trade.

A HOUSE LANDMARK

In the House of Representatives Mr. BURDICK is outstanding. Well over 6 feet tall and bulky even for that height, he is a landmark in the lower chamber. When he gets to his feet and lumbers to the well to speak, Members and visitors alike settle back in anticipation of an enlivening—and, strangely, enlightening—discourse shot through with illustrations from homesteading days and his boyhood with the Indians.

A pureblood Caucasian, Mr. BURDICK nevertheless has grasped the Indian point of view. He is the only Federal legislator who speaks fluent Sioux. The one nonaboriginal subject in his impressive office photo gallery is his Democratic friend, MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. What is more, Mr. BURDICK has written 29 books on frontier days, all of them packed solid with authentic Indian lore.

The North Dakotan gets his knowledge not only from experience, but also from books. He classes himself as a "book-a-day man." To accommodate the fodder of his wide-ranging mind, he has not a book shelf, but a bookhouse, and in it 25,000 volumes, mainly on western history.

GROTON VERSUS COOKSTOVE

His bookishness brought him into warm personal friendship with both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. The contrast of the former, educated at Groton and Harvard, and Mr. BURDICK, who learned his ABC's

Certainly, today's small towns have almost everything—or access to it—that have our largest cities. Grit can't claim all the credit, to be sure. Good roads, the automobile, telephone, movies, and radio—and the boys going to and from two world wars—all have had a part. But Grit has had for many years the largest concentration of circulation in small towns of any publication.

It interests us, too, to see big business recognizing the small towns as sites for new plants. They call it decentralization of industry. But by any name it's a recognition of the stability and worth of smalltown people.

I know Dad would be pleased with all this progress. To do a real job for small-town people—to inspire them to think and to do good, to love America—was his purpose throughout his life; it's the purpose of Grit today, and will be its guide in the future.

Dad died in 1938 at nearly 79. Since then my brother, Howard, and I have been trying to fill his shoes—carry out his ideas, and live up to his ideals. We, too, have added new buildings and equipment to maintain Grit's reputation as one of the best printed and edited papers in the country.

In 1944 we changed the format to tabloid size. We've changed many details to keep it modern, alive, and attune. But in the wholesomeness of its editorial content, in its sectional makeup, and in the inspiration of its appeal to every member of the family, it is quite the same as Dad developed it.

Economic pressures, higher taxes, wages and cost of materials have forced changes he would have been loathe to make. He always wanted to hold the 5-cent piece which of necessity has been raised to 7 and then 10 cents. But the reader-value of the paper has never decreased. His 80–20 ratio of editorial matter to advertising content has never changed. Nor have his appeal to and belief in small-town America or his great interest in boys ever lessened.

Grit has continued to grow in size and influence and importance. More than 700,000 families (3 million people) in 16,000 small towns throughout the Nation, read Grit every week. And nearly 90 percent of them buy their copy from one of 30,000 Grit *salesboys*.

As Grit grew, so has the number of Grit employees. Dad always called them "Grit family." Their interest in the development and progress of Grit knits them together with a loyalty, a record of service, seldom equalled. Of the 289 active employees, 47 are members of Grit's Quarter Century Club. An additional 26, with service records of from 25 to 59 years, still belong to the family under Grit's retirement plan.

HIS GUIDEPOSTS MARK OUR FUTURE

It's a big job to follow a successful man like Dad was—in fact as in the hearts and minds of his fellowmen. Howard and I have struggled to catch his pace. His ideals still govern. And, while some of his methods have been altered to meet today's problems, his standards of life and business, his honesty, and integrity remain our guideposts—guideposts we are endeavoring to keep bright for our 4 sons who are learning the business today.

America is still the land of opportunity—and the soundness of its small-town thinking still holds the keys of liberty and freedom. So long as Grit continues to help build sound minds and sincere hearts in small-town families, the aims and ideals, the loves, and the hopes of that immigrant boy will truly live on and on.

A bronze plaque in our lobby is inscribed "Dietrick Lamade, publisher of Grit, 1884–1938, whose vision, initiative, tenacity, and resourcefulness made him the exemplar of his favorite saying: 'Difficulties show what men are'."

A Misinformed Columnist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 3, 1953

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following articles by J. Audley Boak which appeared in the Pennsylvania Grange News of May 1953:

A MISINFORMED COLUMNIST

"President Eisenhower's policies seem now about to be tested with an old political adage: If the fleshpots don't get you, the crackpots will. These two hazards apply, in that order, to his domestic and foreign programs.

"America's most vocal 'gimmie' group, the subsidized farm bloc, is already bewailing the day when sturdy sons of the pioneers may be brought down to their last Cadillac and private airplane. Here with spring brightening our blessed land, we have the pitiable spectacle of plow-toughened hands stretched palm-upward to Washington.

"It is pitiable because it shows what can happen to a great race of agrarians who have been taught that the place to seek prosperity is at the political rialto rather than at the threshing floor and the smokehouse. For 20 years now the American farmer has been taught to croon noises of self-pity, even while snapping the rubber band on his bank roll or passing his place for a second helping."

The above excerpt is from an article by a nationally known columnist which appeared on March 5 and would be amusing to anyone who knows agriculture and its condition if it were not so misleading and that it misinforms the consumer. Since when did it become an unpardonable sin for a farmer to have a bank roll, or an automobile, or even a plane?

I am inclined to think if any crackpot gets our President, it will be those who magnify every difference of opinion and try to enter a wedge in the administration to split the powers that be.

"Difference of opinion is no crime, as only by difference of opinion is progress to the truth attained." It is evident that the columnist has not read the records of the great agricultural organizations that are on record as opposing subsidies. It is hard to find prosperity on the threshing floor or in the smokehouse when these products are decreasing in price while their operating cost is increasing. I have never favored price fixing, but if the farmer must pay a minimum wage for labor on the threshing floor or in the smokehouse, why should he not have a floor price under his grain, hams, and bacon?

When the hourly wage of the farmer exceeds that of labor or industry, it will be time to talk about the farmer's being overpaid or overprotected, or driving a Cadillac. We will agree that he has been overcontrolled too long.

History proves that agrarian depression precede industrial depressions, so Mr. Columnist, it is to your interest that the farmer has a bank roll. Agriculture has always favored economy and a balanced budget, so Mr. Eisenhower need not fear the long-termed wisdom of the farmer, but the short-termed selfishness of the crackpot.

SHOULD THE VOTING AGE BE REDUCED TO 18 YEARS?

No one denies that a boy who is old enough to carry and use a musket should be able to cast a ballot.

Who wants the age limit reduced?

Do the boys and girls? Do their parents?

Does the general public when only about 40 percent of those who now have the right to vote exercise their privilege?

Is it not the liquor interests that will profit most? A boy or girl who is old enough to vote is old enough to buy liquor legally. Is it worth millions of dollars to the liquor dealers to be allowed to sell to the teenagers?

Could anything please the liquor interests more than to open up to them a field of 10 million youth of the age when habits are formed?

We had better think twice.

Tidelands Case and Bill Murray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 3, 1953

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent article which appeared in the Daily Oklahoman predicting what Bill Murray, former Governor of Oklahoma, would have done had he been Governor of Texas during the tidelands oil fight:

TIDELANDS CASE AND BILL MURRAY

(By Gordon Hines)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Some interesting speculation is presented here on what a colorful Oklahoman might have done if he had occasion to clash with the Federal Government over oil development of tidelands in the gulf. Gordon Hines, the author, is a former newspaperman, more recently a business and market consultant. He is author, among other things, of Alfalfa Bill Murray, a biography of the former Governor.)

What would Alfalfa Bill Murray, former Governor of Oklahoma, have done if he had been Governor of Texas during the tidelands controversy?

As his biographer, who got to know him very well, I am about to hazard a guess. My guess is founded upon the things he did when Federal authorities challenged his powers as governor and threatened to usurp the sovereignty of his State.

Bill Murray, in spite of the crudities his enemies love to exaggerate, is a man cast in the pioneer American mold. One of the country's outstanding authorities on constitutional law, Murray was able to stand on sound legal ground when he defied those who would have encroached upon his State's rights.

Because of my sincere admiration for the man's intelligence and courage, I would not for any consideration wish to offend his fiery independence—his ability and willingness to speak forthrightly for himself on all occasions. So, in speculating upon what he would do or would have done earlier than now if he had been Governor of Texas when the tidelands issue first raised its ugly head, I am not presuming to speak for him—only about him.

I see him hunched over the Governor's desk in Austin, laboring with a lead pencil upon his first draft of a letter to the President of the United States. His old slouch hat would be pulled low over his eyes to shade them; he would have kicked off his shoes; he'd probably be sitting on one foot with the other thrust out at an angle that would have been excruciatingly uncomfortable for anyone but his angular self. He

would be chewing on a cheap cigar and ashes would be scattered over his clothing and the desk. He'd be wearing that old black alpaca office coat, with its burst-out elbows. The fire at the end of his cigar might have gone out, but one would almost expect that letter to the President to be sputtering and sizzling.

I think he'd begin on a brusquely courteous-discourteous note, informing the President that the correspondence would be confidential until a reply had been received, but the old boy would just as brusquely warn the President that the reply had better be satisfactory or he'd release the correspondence to the press.

Then he'd lay his legal groundwork. There would be reference to Spanish grants. Indian treaties, purchase agreements, and historical documents; then he'd come down to the Texas Republic and to the agreement between Texas and the United States Government which brought Texas into statehood. He'd remind the President that Texas was to have ownership, in perpetuity, of 10½ miles of tidelands; that Texas might maintain her own navy if she chose. There would be citations from the Constitution of the United States and from court decisions and from the English common law. Then he'd begin his summation and it might go something like this:

"Texas isn't rebelling against the United States Government, Mr. President. Texas has proved her loyalty and the substance of her patriotic support in the past; she will prove it in the future in all her country's problems and crises—providing problems and crises aren't deliberately created to make tin heroes of demagogs. With between 6 and 7 percent of the Nation's population, Texas supplied 17 percent of the men for the armed services in World War II. With 6 to 7 percent of the population of the Nation, Texas pays approximately 16 percent of the Federal taxes paid by all the States. Texas' natural resources have always been and always will be available to the Nation in a time of emergency. So, you can't question the loyalty of Texas.

"If the point has not been clearly established legally, it is at least logical that it would be immoral and unethical for any representative of the people to surrender the sovereignty of his people. It seems just as logical, then, that it would be immoral and unethical for any official or administration in government to attempt to seize either the sovereignty or property of a lower branch of government.

"When any official of government, from the highest to the lowest, exceeds his legally constituted authority in an attempt to seize the property or sovereignty of another branch of government, he goes outside the law; hence, he is an outlaw and, if he persists, an insurrectionist against that other branch of government.

"Texas does not purpose, Mr. President, to surrender her sovereignty or her property, nor to submit to insurrection against her established rights.

"As Governor of Texas, I am establishing martial law along the coastlines and instructing our National Guard to defend our properties. It may even be necessary to set up a Texas navy for defense.

"Of course, I realize that the United States Army and Navy are bigger than the forces of Texas and that they could seize these Texas properties, but let me remind you that the Constitution of the United States restrains you. It provides that the President of the United States can send Federal troops into a State, but only at the request of the sovereign State. Texas is not requesting such intervention, Mr. President.

"Now, Mr. President, you may instruct one of your Federal judges to issue an injunction against this action by me and to send a United States marshal to serve the injunction upon me. Do this, and I shall put both the judge and the marshal in jail for insurrection against the State of Texas."

Well, that's a guess—but I think it's a fairly accurate guess as to what militant Bill Murray would do in the given circumstances.

Perhaps the country needs a number of "Alfalfa Bill" Murrays—or, if Bill Murray were Governor of Texas, his example might serve as a beacon or as a kick in the pants for other governors who seem either unwilling or incompetent to defend the rights of the people of their States.

Mr. United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COURTNEY W. CAMPBELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 3, 1953

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from E. P. Lambright, editorial director of the Tampa Morning Tribune, Tampa, Fla.:

MR. UNITED STATES

Senator TAFT was called "Mr. Republican." We think a more fitting and just appellation would be "Mr. United States." His comprehensive, accurate, and clear-thinking grasp of national problems, in their relation to domestic and world affairs, earned him place as the best informed and the ablest American public official of his day. In the global picture, he was recognized as the embodiment and exemplar of his and our country.

He was conservative in trend, firm in conviction, sincere in pledge, dependable in performance. Holding high place in Government, he kept his conduct clean—his record was unstained by scandal, untouched by ulterior motive or contaminating influence. He welcomed fair criticism, but resented and rebuked unfounded aspersion. He was never afraid to put his thought into word.

Son of a President, he was born and bred in the atmosphere of statesmanship. Naturally he aspired to be one of what would have been the second father-son presidential succession in our history. He desired to be President, not alone because his father had been, but because he believed he could be of valuable service to the Nation. Three times he was foiled in that ambition, losing the nomination to Willkie in 1940, to Dewey in 1948, to Eisenhower in 1952. These defeats did not embitter him, although the latter was by such a narrow margin as to be particularly disappointing. Despite this severe blow he did not sulk. He strove earnestly and unreservedly for the election of the man who won the prize he so zealously sought.

Always loyal, he gave freely and unselfishly of his time and thought to the support of the new Republican President, the new Republican administration. He emerged from the shadows of defeat as the still recognized and revered leader of his party in Congress. He did not have to offer his advice or aid; he was asked to give it, and invariably did. He was the safe balance wheel, the great stabilizer in national legislation. His aim was to make his party successful in power as it had been at the polls. It was his party's loss—and the Nation's loss—that he was felled at the height of his usefulness. As statesmen go, he was still a young man at 63. Normally, he had many years of distinguished service ahead. But it was not to be. Perhaps the stress and strain of combat hastened his end. Disease struck; dread cancer gnawed his vitals, corrupted his blood stream. In a New York hospital, after a momentary rally had brought hope for the better, he passed into the eternal silences.

* * * * *

Whatever may develop politically from Senator TAFT's death, the fact remains that the party, the Senate, and the country have lost an incomparable leader, a vacancy that gapes with the inadequacy of any apparent possibility of its attempted occupancy.

Installment Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 3, 1953

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in a period of war or grave national emergency, I have never objected to controls over installment credit. But I have objected, and do object, to such controls on a permanent basis.

There appears evidence at this time that the Federal Reserve Board has embarked upon a program to make such controls permanent, or at least to amend the Federal Reserve Act to such an extent that the authority for imposing and enforcing such controls is permanent.

In an effort to explain some of the Board's activities in the field of purely personal matters, such as the spending habits of the American public, I want to say a few words about installment-credit controls. These controls have been on and off the statute books since 1941, and were handed to the Federal Reserve Board for administration and enforcement. Congress dropped them last year. The controls, known as regulation W, gave the Board power to fix the amount of down payments on such items as washing machines, TV-radio sets, furniture, refrigerators, and other household appliances. Under terms of these powers, the Board also could, and did, set terms for small loans from banks and consumer finance companies. Regulation W does not apply to large commercial loans.

The Board now is making a drive for permanent authority over the relationship between borrower and lender, and between buyer and seller. The Board's current argument is not based on the pretext that installment-credit controls are needed to stem inflation, but rather on the theory that a $70-a-week clerk might buy furniture on the installment plan and may not be able to meet his payments. Such a transaction seems to me to be the personal business of retailers who risk their own money.

Here I want to mention the National Foundation for Consumer Credit which is doing an excellent job of installment credit education. The foundation is a nonprofit research organization, financed by manufacturers, retailers, distributors, bankers, and other lending institutions. The foundation has been saying all along that the purchase of a washing machine has nothing to do with inflation, a fact now admitted by the Board itself.

The foundation, directed by William J. Cheyney, former college professor of